Fall 2021

Seneca, The Humors, and Revenge Tragedy

ANDREW STESIENKO
University of New Hampshire, Durham

Seneca, the Humors, and Revenge Tragedy

By

Andrew Stesienko

BA, College of Charleston, 2010

MA, University of Arizona, 2014

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the University of New Hampshire

In Partial Fulfillment of

The Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

In

English Literature

September, 2021

This dissertation was examined and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of PhD in English Literature by:

Douglas Lanier (Director), Professor, English, University of New Hampshire

Dennis Britton, Associate Professor, University of New Hampshire

Mary Floyd-Wilson, Professor, English, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

R. Scott Smith, Professor, Classics, University of New Hampshire

Samantha Seal, Associate Professor, English, University of New Hampshire

Approval signatures are on file with the University of New Hampshire Graduate School

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you, Mom and Dad.

This dissertation was completed with funding from the UNH College of Liberal Arts Dissertation Acceleration Award.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation argues that moral and religious authorities of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods adapted rules for emotional governance from Senecan philosophy. These Senecan rules helped institute a performance-based approach to managing emotion, which relied on programmatic meditation, rhetoric, and behavior to change one's emotional state. This approach ostensibly offered more personal control over affective inclination, which according to the period's Galenic paradigms, was heavily influenced by environmental and physiological factors. My project examines revenge tragedy to highlight Senecan-inspired affect management as practiced by aspiring avengers. Because revenging hopefuls must amplify and then mobilize their feelings in order to achieve violent retribution, they use performative routines to curate an emotional disposition conducive to revenge. I examine this process in *Hamlet, The Rape of Lucrece, Titus Andronicus, The Spanish Tragedy,* and Henry Chettle's understudied *Hoffman.*

Characters from these texts show that performative routines allowed greater control over feeling, despite humoral theory's determinism. Such autonomy also undermined humoralism's core tenets, contributing to an epistemic shift that replaced it with more accurate notions of internal physiology. This ambivalence appears most vividly through strong female revengers, as they reject the Galenic view that colder female bodies could only barely manage extreme feelings. Women who successfully use performance to manage emotion therefore best illustrate the way that such routines concurrently strengthened and weakened Galenic paradigms. Performative routines could create or justify an aberration in humoral theory (such as a competent female revenger), making humoralism more hospitable to individuals seeking control. But at the same time, they produced counterexamples that would help contribute to humoralism's demise.

INTRODUCTION

In his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, Robert Burton invokes the central question of early modern affect[1]. In early modern medicine, which was influenced greatly by Hippocrates and Galen, it was assumed that one's emotional disposition was strongly determined by the level and quantity of four fluids, called humors. Because each humor predisposed the body to a corresponding set of feelings, Burton and other early modern thinkers wondered whether individuals really held agency over their affective states. Could the conscious mind intervene in the production of feeling, even though that production was theorized to be heavily physiological? Burton poses the question thus:

> "Manners do follow the temperature of the body," as Galen proves in his book of that subject . . . We see this in old men, children, Europeans, Asians, hot and cold climes; sanguine are merry, melancholy sad, phlegmatic dull, by reason of abundance of those humors, and they cannot resist such passions which are inflicted by them . . . How should a man choose but be choleric and angry, that hath his body so clogged with abundance of gross humors? Or melancholy, that is so inwardly disposed? (1.2.374-75).

Here, Burton asks if one might feel anything besides the default condition created by the body's "abundance of those humors." If one is "so inwardly disposed" to merriment, sadness, or dullness because of their physiological makeup, then could they successfully choose to be anything else? Because it assumed that one's feelings were the product of physiological hydraulics rather than choice, humoral theory posed huge complications for thinkers concerned with religious and moral ethics. Could one be held liable for feelings that appeared independent of morality or rationality? Burton and other period authorities would answer these pressing

queries by adapting the Roman philosopher Seneca's strategies for affective governance. By adapting these rules, Burton would disprove or at least complicate the humoral truism he offers at the beginning: "Manners do follow the temperature of the body." Instead, taking inspiration from Seneca, Burton and others would show that manners engendered through the body's physiological baseline could be actually be altered through programmatic meditation, rhetoric, or behavior.

By examining the way early modern affect theorists adapted Senecan ideas and used them to guide affect, this dissertation participates in a wider scholarly project to investigate affect beyond physiological determinism. In *The Renaissance of Emotion: Understanding Affect in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries,* Richard Meek and Erin Sullivan argue that scholars of affect have mainly focused on *"*the physiological determinism of emotion in early modern texts, arguing that feeling was something that happened *to* the body of the passive, receptive subject, who either gave way to these material impulses or attempted to resist them through Stoical self-control" (3). Although the first wave of affect scholars do acknowledge that individuals could consciously influence their physiology and emotional disposition[2] , the current wave of humoral scholarship nonetheless seeks narrower investigation of how "other intellectual and creative frameworks, such as religious and philosophical belief, political performance, or rhetorical or dramaturgical style also shaped cultural beliefs about emotional experience" (5). Meek and Sullivan contend that because early modern theories of emotion were constructed through insights from "philosophical, spiritual, psychological, and creative engagements," scholars must "give more attention to the other systems of knowledge and representation that people used to conceptualize and articulate emotional experience" (6). My focus on the Senecan affect management principles imported into humoralism counterbalances an emphasis on physiological

determinism, as it shows that humoral subjects possessed powerful strategies for manipulating their affective states to achieve desired results. These Senecan strategies were systematized, recorded in emotional taxonomies like Burton's, and then accepted and practiced by a public who understood them as tools for creating and shaping individual affective disposition. The cumulative effect of Senecan philosophy on humoral theory was ambivalent. On one hand, the flexibility it provided made humoral theory more palpable to individual subjects, since it gave them a high degree of autonomy in a system perceived as mechanical and morally neutral. But at the same time, this flexibility also undermined the determinism at the core of humoral theory and thus highlighted instances of its falseness.

The pioneering studies on early modern humor help establish the problematic determinism of humoral theory. Michael Schoenfeldt explains how the humoral system assumed that each body's physiological makeup contributed to an individual's baseline physical constitution and personality traits:

> Physical health and mental disposition were determined by the balance within the body of the four humoral fluids produced by the various stages of digestion – blood, phlegm, yellow bile, and black bile. These fluids are then dispersed throughout the body by spirits, mediators between soul and body . . . Under this regime, illness is not the product of an infection from without but rather is the result of an imbalance of humoral fluid (2).

Although bodily composition provided one with a default constitution and affective register, early moderns nonetheless viewed the humoral bodily as porous, vulnerable, and continually in motion. They assumed that exterior forces or environmental factors could cause shifts in humoral balance, which would cause a corresponding change to one's health and temperament. Factors

such as climate and temperature, food and drink intake, and exposure to vapor were all potential disruptors of physiological balance. The strong influence exerted by these external factors seemed to further minimize the subject's ability to govern their feelings in a deliberate way. Given that factors outside individual control caused humoral fluctuation, one might be involuntarily conditioned to feel or behave in a way that clashes with one's sense of identity, personal values, or dearly-held moral or religious ethics. And in cases when external factors were thought to have altered one's disposition and compelled them to bad behavior, how should God or society justly account for the individual's lack of control over their actions? Quandaries like these highlight the intervention that needed to be made within humoral theory. Ultimately, because early modernity's highly physiological account of emotion seemed insufficiently positioned to accommodate issues of moral, ethical, or spiritual complexity, thinkers like Robert Burton worked to modify their understanding of affect and make it more hospitable to these concerns.

Through a process of appropriation, the early modern affective taxonomists successfully added elements of rational and moral agency that were missing from the otherwise mechanical humoral paradigm. They turned to Seneca's philosophical treatise *De Ira*, taking its strategies for affect management and establishing them as early modern best practices for manipulating one's default affective disposition. In *De Ira*, which gives practical advice for diffusing anger, Seneca articulates a regime for controlling emotion so that one might live according to the precepts of Stoic morality, which was to govern the inner self so that one might remain unbowed by the vicissitudes of life. According to Colin Burrow, the Stoics believed that:

> The passions should be mastered so that man . . . can avoid unnecessarily subjecting himself to fortune. A 'vir virtutis' (a man of virtue) stands constant, is firm and secure in

> himself, and controls passions within him so that he can avoid subjection to the world around him . . . If the man of virtue, or the ideal figure of the 'sage', was finally overwhelmed by Fortune and rendered unable to control his passions, he would rationally choose to kill himself in order to avoid subjecting himself to external events, achieving sovereignty over his own being even when he had lost control of his body and his fate" (167).

Burrow identifies that Stoic practitioners seek to master internal strategies for subjugating provocations to destructive feelings that would clash with disciplined self-governance. One must "control passions within him so that he can avoid subjection to the world around him." In other words, the Stoic must ensure that their personal reasoning or volition, rather than any influences from the outside world, authorize and control their feelings. In order to achieve this state of self-mastery, Seneca proposes two methods of affect management in *De Ira*. First, Seneca tells his readers to avoid anger or other negative emotions through delay, which means to avoid acting on negative impressions until reason comes to a proper judgment of them. Second, when in danger of succumbing to anger or another vice, one should meditate on or perform a different type of feeling. Seneca proposes that by deliberately changing an external countenance or gesture, by outwardly departing from unwanted or unethical interior impulses, one can resist the descent into the full, potentially ruinous embrace of destructive affect. This strategy, which I term displacement, would become the early modern period's most valued tool for managing humoral disposition. It instituted a performative model of affect management, one where the individual consciously mediated on or acted out desired emotions.

Senecan rules for affect management were adaptable to early modern humoral theory because both systems presuppose innate interconnectivities between different types of matter.

Both systems feature reciprocities between matter that reduces or even, in some cases, eliminates boundaries between corporeal and incorporeal objects. After identifying that Seneca's version of Stoic cosmology was inspired by the earlier philosopher Chrysippus, Burrow explains how Seneca would have understood the interconnected universe:

> According to Stoic physics, all aspects of the universe, from man to beast through waves and stars, are animated by a single pneuma or spirit, which made the cosmos a unity akin to that of an animate being . . . The unity of the Stoic cosmos meant that for many Stoics when one element in the universe stretches or deforms, the rest of the world connectedly deforms. As a result, a personal passion might cause a reverberation in the cosmos. The interconnectedness of objects and beings in Stoic thought extends through time as well as space, through a complex system of causes (Burrow 180-81).

When Burrow explains that "a personal passion might cause a reverberation in the cosmos," he alludes to the way that Stoic pneuma unified the corporeal and the incorporeal. Tom Rosenmeyer elaborates on this Stoic synthesis of matter, explaining the connectedness of the universe means that "all that exists is corporeal . . . justice, passion, reason, truth, vices, judgments, the soul . . . Events are corporeal, and so are their causes" (94-95). If events and their causes are corporeal, then an individual's actions are not merely mechanical; they are instead imbued with the moral energy of their motivating causes. In other words, Stoic thought presupposed that impulses, feelings, and judgments were embedded within the actions they motivated. Such a synthesis gave these intangible elements a physical substance that yoked them to other elements in the corporeal universe. Because they explained ways in which ethics were tangibly expressed through physical objects or observable events, Stoic tenets would prove useful in rectifying pure humoral theory's lack of attention to moral complexities.

Like the Stoic cosmos, humoral theory also maintained that disparate objects were linked together by powerful connectivities. In her pioneering monograph *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearian Stage*, Gail Kern Paster uses the term "humoral ecology" to discuss the reciprocities inherent in the humoral system. For her, this term encapsulates the way "the passions and the body" must be understood "in ecological terms – that is, in terms of that body's reciprocal relation to the world" (18). Humoral theory asserted that all matter in the universe was powered by energy from the four elements: air, fire, water, and earth. These elemental energies not only animated the world's tangible, external matter, but they also charged a corresponding humor within the body. Because internal and external matter share the same energy source, the humoral system lashes together "the mind, the body, and the world . . . through what philosopher Andy Clark describes as a network of 'mutually modulatory influences' in a dynamic action of 'continual reciprocal causation'" (Paster 10). In simpler terms, because internal bodily matter and external objects were interconnected and could influence each other, changes to one might result in changes to the other. Paster examines "self report by characters in the throes of strong feeling" to establish this "demonstrable psychophysiological reciprocity between the experiencing subject and his or her relation to the world" (19). Wary of external forces that might suddenly and unexpectedly manipulate humors, early moderns conceived of selfhood as "a fragile and unstable edifice, eternally under construction, and assailed on all sides (including the insides) by insurgent passions" (Schoenfeldt 73). However, on the other hand, this ecological embeddedness also gave early moderns a powerful capacity for self-determination. Katherine Craik and Tanya Pollard illustrate this capacity by citing the physician Thomas Fienus, who details "the power of the imagination to bring about physiological change" (5). Inspired by Senecan displacement, Fineus argues that one can change their affective disposition by

meditating on a particular feeling through the help of books, art, or plays. This act alters the humors and "transform[s] the body" in a material way, potentially making it more conducive to a desired affective state (Craik and Pollard 5). The reciprocal quality of the humoral universe, then, could alternatively bring uplift or degradation. But because it was indeed reciprocal in nature, humoral theory could easily appropriate Stoic conceits designed for application in a similar context.

Given that early modern epistemology compressed a variety of disciplines – including medicine and philosophy – under the auspice of religious authority, humoral theory needed to be assimilated into Christianity in order to fit into early modern culture. Because Seneca's rules posited that feelings and actions could be suffused with moral energy, they helped make humoral theory attractive and adaptable to early modern Christians seeking to understand how perceived physiological realities might be accommodated to a spiritual regime concerned with piety and salvation. The moral agency provided by delay and displacement thus made humoral theory eminently hospitable to a Christian cosmos. These strategies served as a way to condition pious affect and good behavior, through which one could triumph over body mechanics that might motivate impious feelings and immoral behavior. Christian authorities used this concept to fashion a narrative about salvation: in order to achieve salvation, destructive impulses produced by the unruly body needed to be quelled. Gail Kern Paster, Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson explain that this narrative imported as its foundation the classical understanding of affect, which depicted the "passions as perturbations, or perilous forces that acted on the suffering body" (12). Senecan displacement eventually became the key strategy for mitigating these perturbations. Catholic and Protestant thinkers sanctioned and elevated displacement by asserting that it was modeled by Christ himself. Because his sacrifice on the cross "combat[ed] anger and

revenge with love," his manner of death illustrates how one might perform a desired emotion and allow it to supercede a negative or unwanted one (12). By associating displacement with Christ's example, religious authorities positioned it as a strategy that one must emulate to follow Christ, thus endorsing it to the Christian corpus of believers. Thanks in large part to this classical understanding of affect management, the early moderns were able to systematize performative affect management and integrate it into a Christian framework.

The proceeding chapters investigate the myriad ways in which Senecan affect management rules were incorporated into early modern religious, medical, and socio-political systems of knowledge. The chapters exclusively analyze revenge narrative because they bear a special relationship to affective politics. Because the call to revenge requires that the aspiring avenger assess their feelings and then mobilize them to work towards retaliation, revenge narratives feature copious examples of characters who choose to implement affect management routines. Chapter 1 outlines the affect management rules found in Seneca's *De Ira*, and then explains how they were appropriated by Robert Burton and other early modern taxonomists. I show these rules as they appear in *Hamlet*, while arguing that Hamlet, as a student of the theatre, understands performative affective management through the lens of drama. Hamlet's theatrical understanding of affect management would have held special appeal to nobles and courtiers, as they would have understood displacement as essential to survival and success in courtly life. In a tightly policed social structure where adopting the wrong exterior affective posture might offend the monarch and bring ruin, the ability to emote according to the monarch's pleasure was paramount to advancement.

Chapter 2 examines the main characters in the narrative poem *The Rape of Lucrece* to explain that affect management routines took varied shapes based on individual subject

positions. Gender, class, familial status, religion, and socio-cultural attributes all converged to modify the affective program that an individual revenger might set in motion. Lucrece, Brutus, and Collatine all illustrate this particularity, as they implement different affect management routines to make their versions of revenge fit with the demands of their gendered and political statuses. My analysis maintains tight focus on how the physiological understanding of gender created different expectations for male and female revengers. It was thought that hotter male bodies were better conductors of the blood and choler necessary for revenge, while colder female bodies were less effective at processing or managing these humors. I examine Tarquin, Lucrece, and Brutus and Collatine to show how these gendered physiological paradigms condoned or even sanctioned male revenge while circumscribing female revenge. Lucrece illustrates that females called to revenge were oppressed by two interlocking types of patriarchal conceits: medical ideas that assumed an inherent weakness afflicted women's bodies and degraded their capacity for affect management, and cultural ideas that discouraged women from acting boldly or participating in the political arenas dominated by males.

Chapter 3 continues to investigate the burden placed on female revengers. It first compiles classical representations of angry or revenging women as bombastic or vindictive Furies, which offered a default narrative suggesting that female anger and revenge were monstrous. These classical depictions gave precedent and corroboration to humoral theories suggesting that women could be easily made irrational or hysterical by grief or rage (notwithstanding that male revengers often exhibit these exact qualities), and were thus unfit to accomplish a revenge that required careful planning or deliberation. I examine three female revenge protagonists to investigate their level of conformity or resistance to this stereotype. *Titus Andronicus's* Tamora mostly adheres to the stereotype, while Bel-Imperia from *The Spanish*

Tragedy begins to depart from it. Bel-Imperia resists the grotesque image of the Furies through her graceful bearing, but because of the ambiguity of her death within the play-within-a-play, it is too difficult to tell whether or not she refutes medical notions of female bodily weakness. Instead of Bel-Imperia, I find a stronger demonstration of female affective agency and competence in the Duchess Martha from Henry Chettle's underappreciated and understudied *Hoffman or A Revenge for a Father*. Martha repudiates both the image of the Furies and the humoral notions of feminine weakness, as she uses displacement to excise her grief, maintain composure and rationality, and assume a resolute affective posture more associated with men. Martha then devises a way to eliminate her son's murderer without deviating from her society's standards of feminine conduct. Martha's admirable self-governance and efficient revenge demonstrates that Senecan affect management tools were presumed powerful enough to elevate the individual above physiological determinism. In this dissertation's conclusion, I use Martha to contend that humoral theory was destabilized in part by real-life and artistic examples of feminine affective competency. Women who surpass the low bar set by humoralism, whether it be Martha or Queen Elizabeth I, called into question the veracity of a medical schema that accounted for human personalities via physiological and environmental determinism. Because Senecan rules for affect management relied on a mental power that was less affected by the gendered body, they offered a pathway by which women could ostensibly transcend determinism. The figure of the competent female revenger, then, speaks to the thrust of this project's broader argument: at the same time Senecan affect management made humoral theory palpable to many by providing greater agency, it concurrently enabled the production of counternarratives that would help other, more rigorously scientific discourses displace humoral theory as the dominant medical paradigm.

Chapter 1: Senecan Influence on Early Modern Emotional Phenomenology

Introduction: How Melancholy is Hamlet, Really?

Within both the Shakespeare canon and in popular culture at large, there are few more synonymous pairings of character and emotional disposition than Hamlet and melancholy. The Danish prince's most enduring lines – those which have arrested imaginations and been adapted, altered, and reproduced across artistic mediums for centuries – all seem to convey a self-critical man who responds to misfortune with indecision and frustration[3]. Hamlet's (and Shakespeare's) most widely-reused quotation contributes powerfully to this image, as it depicts metaphysical indecisiveness with poetic grandeur. When wondering if it is better "to be, or not to be" (3.1.55), Hamlet never makes a conclusion because he doesn't know whether some aspect of death or non-existence might be worse than the "heart-ache, and the thousand natural shocks / That flesh is heir to" (3.1.61-62). He can only comment on the problem's complexity, declaring that "to die" is "the rub" because "in that sleep of death, what dreams may come, / When we have shuffled off this mortal coil, / Must give us pause" (3.1.63-67). In addition to this touchstone speech, Hamlet's extended self-critique in Act II also contributes to his association with melancholy and indecisiveness. He delivers over forty lines of rhetorical self-flagellation, decrying what he names as an inability to exhibit the audacious and purposeful disposition necessary to revenge his father. By his own admission, Hamlet is "a rogue and peasant slave" (2.2.550), a "dull and muddy-mettled rascal" who lacks the mental energy necessary to adequately overcome a crisis (2.2.565).

Hamlet's most famous words reinforce his association with melancholy, but the connection is unfair and inaccurate. First, the "to be or not to be" speech appears in a context where Hamlet deliberately feigns confusion for strategic purposes, so that he may mask his vengeful intent and mislead his enemies. Instead of acknowledging his desire for vengeance, he expresses a false bewilderment overhead by Ophelia, who speaks with him in person, and by the hidden Polonius and Claudius, who are spying on him. In an ironic twist, this performance has come to define Hamlet because of its re-appropriation and citation throughout popular culture. In this chapter, I argue that Hamlet's melancholy and indecisiveness is not a fixed identity or even a dominant character trait, as we might expect based on a cursory understanding of the play or a look at its cultural resonance. Instead, Hamlet's caution is only a temporary emotional position within the ever-shifting matrix of humoral ecology. This argument seems especially tenable in light of the early modern period's Galenic worldview, which assumed that affective disposition might be altered by physiological changes facilitated by a wide variety of factors. The character changes that Hamlet exhibits in Acts IV and V further suggest that his reluctance and hesitancy are impermanent traits that may be modified and reconditioned. Hamlet's shift from fracturing uncertainty to imperturbable resolve occurs not because of natural fluctuations in his humoral body, but because he uses deliberate mental and behavioral performance to alter his physiology, correspondingly alter his feelings, and thus maintain control over emotional disposition. By consciously working to govern his feelings and emote in a desired way, Hamlet demonstrates a level of mental autonomy and psychological complexity that contradicts the view that early modern subjects considered themselves wholly Galenic bodies. Instead, Hamlet's use of performative affect management demonstrates that deliberate mental and physical activity played

just as strong a role in early modern humoral ecology as physiological and environmental factors.

In the pages that follow, I argue that the performative approach modeled by Hamlet was introduced to the early modern period by way of Senecan philosophy. To make this claim, I first present Seneca's philosophy of affect management by reading his treatise on anger: *De Ira*. This text provides two major protocols for governing affect, which I refer to as delay and displacement. *De Ira* tells readers to delay acting out while under the influence of any sudden, impulsive bursts of feeling. To practice delay, one must wait out the initial force of mental or emotional shock, allowing that impact to dissipate so that reason may return and properly assess the situation. Delay helps enable displacement, which proposes that one may replace an unwanted feeling by thinking on – and thus summoning into being – an opposite feeling. After presenting Seneca's emotional phenomenology, I argue that displacement became the cornerstone practice of early modern affective management routines. It appears in the period's most widely republished emotional taxonomies: Thomas Wright's *Passions of the Mind in General* (1601) and Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1620). Like *De Ira*, these texts encourage readers to use meditation and performance to determine their affective states. But in an evolution from *De Ira*, they accommodate Senecan notions of delay and displacement to the early modern period's Galenic paradigms. Specifically, they combine a Senecan phenomenology, where the mind alone determines emotional state, with an early modern humoral ecology where conscious desires about what to feel compete with other determinants of feeling, including the body's physiological baseline and external influences. I use this chapter's concluding section to return to Hamlet and argue that his full affective trajectory illustrates this early modern update to Senecan philosophies of affect. Hamlet's change demonstrates how

Senecan ideas gave the early modern subject a radical potential for self-transformation, even in spite of the many influences thought to afflict the porous humoral body and potentially destabilize its delicate affective balance.

Hamlet's efforts to transform affect also illustrate an idea also explored in Chapter 2 of this work, which is that revenge narratives have special relevance to studies of affective politics. The provocation to revenge forces characters to engage with their own affective states and the broader humoral ecology influencing their feelings. Mobilizing oneself toward revenge requires accounting for the multiple layers of feeling engendered by the situation: grief at injury or loss, disdain for the injurer, outrage at the cosmic or political injustice of the injury, and even considerations of what makes an appropriate or effective revenge. These questions prompt varying answers from avengers based on their differences in gender, class, and socio-cultural differences. And because of the Galenic worldview reflected in early modern drama, avengers also plot retaliatory actions based their understanding of their personal bodily and affective dispositions. Hamlet and Bel-Imperia offer an instructive contrast in how humoral differences require that each avenger adopt an individualized affect management routine. Hamlet perceives himself as not prone to the sanguinity and choler that inspires revenge, so his affective trajectory is to build toward this disposition throughout the course of the play. Bel-Imperia understands that she already possesses these humoral traits, so her affective trajectory is to subdue these impulses and wait until the right moment to unleash them. Despite their differences in gender, class, and humor, Hamlet and Bel-Imperia both reckon with their affective states after being prompted by the call to revenge. Furthermore, each character's reckoning results in their use of Senecan principles to cultivate the best temperament for an effective revenge. These principles might be used differently according to the revenger's personal agenda, but using them reveals that early

modern subjects had a powerful ability to transform their physiological and emotional dispositions to better achieve a desired outcome.

Part I: *De Ira* and Senecan Affect

Seneca articulates his affective philosophy and his protocols for affect management in his examination of anger: *De Ira*. This text appeared in the first century AD, before Galen's birth in 129 AD. It therefore predates Galen's emphasis on the humoral subject. Instead, Seneca offers a paradigm where one's interior decision-making exerts singular control over affective disposition. In Seneca's view, the subject has a moral obligation to use this mental power to prevent or banish deleterious or harmful feelings. He adopts this view because of his Stoic prescriptions, which mandate that one must strive to reject feelings and actions that cause harm. *De Ira* clarifies that individuals must repudiate anger because "man's nature is not . . . desirous of inflicting punishment; neither, therefore, is anger in accordance with man's nature, because that is desirous of inflicting punishment" (1.6). Seneca thus disagrees with Aristotle's contention that anger provides occasional benefits, namely its assistance in what Aristotle would call a justified conflict. In contrast to Aristotle who maintains that anger "is necessary, nor can any fight be won without it," Seneca argues that "anger has nothing useful in itself, and does not rouse up the mind to warlike deeds . . . a virtue, being self-sufficient, never needs the assistance of a vice" (1.9). This dispute with Aristotle, then, helps clarify that Senecan affect management protocols are designed to condition the mind to reject all incitements to negative feelings. Because Seneca does not believe that vices offer any redeeming utility or value, his standards for proper affective

governance demand that one construct interior bulwarks that can resist any and all movements toward deleterious affective states which may facilitate immoral conduct.

The major conflict in Senecan emotional phenomenology, then, is the mind's battle against provocations to feelings that motivate bad behavior. Modern scholars understand these provocations as shocks or impressions that work to move one into a harmful affective state, referring to them as "pre-passions." Seneca describes the pre-passions as involuntary movements toward a particular feeling, which are then either accepted or rejected by the mind. According to Seneca, one might observe pre-passions when "men's hair rises up at bad news, their faces blush at indecent words, and they are seized with dizziness when looking down a precipice; and as it is not in our power to prevent any of these things, no reasoning can prevent their taking place" (2.2). Instead of being emotions unto themselves, these sensations are "rudiments which may grow into passions" (2.2). Instead, only mental acceptance of the impression presented by the pre-passion constitutes a genuine feeling. Pre-passions that threaten to incite one to fear, grief, or anger might strike an individual "unexpectedly and against their will" (Graver 306). But Seneca asserts that the ideal Stoic sage holds the mental wherewithal to resist capitulating to the pre-passion. The sage would instead be guided by "the preeminence of reason, which judges correctly that no real misfortune has taken place" (Graver 307). In other words, the Stoic sage might feel provocation toward an unwanted feeling, but mental rejection of that provocation prevents the feeling from occurring. Seneca clarifies this position by explaining that though the wise man might "feel certain hints and semblances of passions . . . he will be free from the passions themselves" (2.16). He therefore positions the mind as the supreme governor of affect, able to maintain emotional equilibrium in spite of contrary influences. "The mind can carry out whatever orders it gives itself," he contends, "some have succeeded in never smiling: some have

forbidden themselves wine, sexual intercourse, or even drink of all kinds" (2.12). Seneca sees these remarkable feats of mental governance as evidence that the mind retains exclusive control over feeling. His emphasis on mental strength would be an important addition to early modern humoral ecology, as humoral subjects would need methods for resisting the outside influences on their bodies and affective charges.

Because Seneca positions the mind as the exclusive determinant of feeling, Senecan emotional phenomenology maintains that there can be only one cause of affective mutability or instability: a misguided judgment or compromised mind. In a passage from *De Ira* that scholars have identified as crucial to his philosophy of emotion, Seneca illustrates the way mental assent precedes acts motivated by negative emotions:

> Our [the Stoics'] opinion is, that anger can venture upon nothing by itself, without the approval of mind: for to conceive the idea of a wrong having been done, to long to avenge it, and to join . . . that we ought not to have been injured and that it is our duty to avenge our injuries, cannot belong to a mere impulse which is excited without our consent. That impulse is a simple act; this is a complex one, and composed of several parts. The man understands something to have happened: he becomes indignant thereat: he condemns the deed; and he avenges it. All these things cannot be done without his mind agreeing to those matters which touched him (2.1).

Close reading of this passage helps us map the process by which mental weakness or error prefigures and authorizes negative or destructive feelings. The passage identifies that the subject first encounters a "mere impulse" of indignation. By itself, this impulse toward indignation is morally neutral and "can venture upon nothing." However, if paired with "the approval of mind,"

this pre-passion may grow into genuine anger that may motivate harmful behavior. In this case, the mind authorizes revenge by justifying the indignant sentiment embedded in the pre-passion. By judging "that we ought not to have been injured and that it is our duty to avenge our injuries," the thinker provides a rationale that first validates the move toward indignation and then condones a redress for injury. This rationale motivates behavior undertaken to achieve that redress, which may include outbursts that Seneca terms "passions."

While early moderns use "passions" to denote external or humoral forces that involuntarily afflict the vulnerable body, the Senecan definition refers to a fit of illogical, harmful, or immoral behavior motivated by a bad value judgment. *De Ira* explains that "a passion . . . consists not in being affected by the sights which are presented to us, but in giving way to our feelings and following up these chance promptings" (2.3). Once the subject assents to the "chance promptings" of a pre-passion, they may engage in histrionic or hostile activity that "goes beyond reason and carries her away with it" (2.3). During this episode, the "excited and shaken" mind "goes whither the passions drive it . . . when it has abandoned itself to anger, love, or any other passion, [the mind] is unable to check itself: its own weight and the downward tendency of vices must carry the man off and hurl him into the lowest depth" (2.7). This emotional frenzy can last for an indeterminate amount of time, ending only when one's feelings exhaust themselves. Seneca accounts for this variable duration by reminding readers that "once passion has been admitted to the mind, and has by our own free will been given a certain authority, it will for the future do as much as it chooses" (2.8). Given the difficulty of stopping passions once activated, it was an imperative of Senecan moral and emotional philosophy to stymie pre-passions at the start. In an explanation that emphasizes preventative discipline, Seneca counsels that the "best plan is to reject straightway the first incentives to anger, to resist

its very beginnings, and to take care not to be betrayed into it" (2.8). One must implement this pre-emptive maintenance because "the mind does not stand apart and view its passions from without . . . but it is itself changed into a passion, and is therefore unable to check what was once useful and wholesome strength, now that it has become degenerate and misapplied" (2.8). Seneca's contention that the mind can be "changed into a passion" reveals that he understands a passion as a state of intoxication, a frenzied spell in which a primal impulse is allowed to usurp the higher functioning rationalities that normally maintain emotional equilibrium. Because of the destructive potential of this state, routines to strengthen one's resolve against pre-passions were of the utmost importance.

De Ira offers specific strategies to neutralize pre-passions, but more importantly, it also explains that there is some recourse to mollify passions even if they grow to concerning levels. The text's third book offers practical instruction for diffusing anger, but this guidance comes in a general form that can be applied to other negative affects as well. In this section, Seneca explains that in order to "drive anger from our minds, or at least curb and restrain its impulses," one must recognize "how great and fresh its strength may be, and whether it may be driven forcibly back and suppressed, or whether we must give way to it until its first storm blow over" (3.1). Here, Seneca obliquely refers to delay and displacement, suggesting that readers have a choice to delay passion's impact until reason returns or to resist passion by meditating on or performing alternate feelings. He first outlines delay, explaining that mitigating the impact of passion's "first storm" requires one to refrain from acting while under influences that might otherwise facilitate destructive conduct:

> [Delay] . . . gives time for the cloud which darkens the mind either to disperse or at any rate to become less dense. Of these wrongs which drive you frantic, some will grow

> lighter after an interval, not of a day, but even of an hour: some will vanish altogether . . . nothing can be accurately discerned at a time of disturbance . . . While you are angry, you ought not to be allowed to do anything "Why?" do you ask? Because when you are angry there is nothing that you do not wish to be allowed to do (3.12).

This definition of delay suggests that while presented with a pre-passion or afflicted by a passion, the mind fixates on – and perhaps even acts on – immoral fantasies that might be injurious, lustful, or envious. In this state, one disregards moral reasoning to the point where "there is nothing that you do not wish to be allowed to do." But one can stop these temptations by refraining from any action for even a brief period of time, perhaps a day or "even an hour." This time of inactivity allows reason to return and supersede any destabilizing impulses that might negatively influence decision-making. In other words, waiting out your anger allows the mind to "form a right judgment about it: if it delays, it will come to an end" (2.29).

In addition to serving as its own method of affect management, Senecan delay enables the even stronger strategy of displacement. While discussing delay, Seneca offers a rationale explaining why it is effective. In doing so, he explains how an unwanted affect might be excised through a deliberately summoned, contrary affect:

> Fight hard with yourself and if you cannot conquer anger, do not let it conquer you . . . Let us conceal its symptoms, and as far as possible keep it secret and hidden. It will give us great trouble to do this, for it is eager to burst forth, to kindle our eyes and to transform our face; but if we allow it to show itself in our outward appearance, it is our master. Let it rather be locked in the innermost recesses of our breast, and be borne by us, not bear us: nay, let us replace all its symptoms by their opposites; let us make our countenance

> more composed than usual, our voice milder, our step slower. Our inward thoughts gradually become influenced by our outward demeanour (3.13).

Here, Seneca explains that one should try to delay anger because external appearance and activity can corrupt internal reasoning; a dangerous affect like anger can "become our master" if the mind allows it to find expression through the body. To guard against impulses that tyrannize reason and compel behavior, Seneca introduces a regime in which one can temper these impulses through their opposites: "Let us replace all symptoms by their opposites," he proposes. This regime operates on the premise that working to express the new emotion can help engender it in an authentic way. Seneca provides an example of this strategy in action by discussing Socrates, who preserved his composure during fits of anger through acts of physical performance. Whenever Socrates "lowered his voice and became sparing of speech," his closest friends knew that he was "exercising restraint over himself." When these acquaintances, who were "used to detect[ing] him acting thus," accused Socrates of being angry, Socrates was not "displeased at being charged with concealment of anger; indeed, how could he help being glad that many men should perceive his anger, yet that none should feel it" (3.13). This anecdote sees Socrates demonstrate a laudable mental and physical mastery over affect, one that requires him to use a performative "outward demeanor" to mitigate, alter, or eliminate an interior impulse. Though Socrates feels an internal incitement to anger, he performs taciturnity to mollify this feeling and helps his mind retain control of his affective disposition. This strategy of displacement set a powerful precedent that would be picked up by the early moderns and made into the essential practice of their affective management routines.

Senecan displacement would later appeal to the most elite audiences of early modern plays. In displacement, nobles and courtiers may have seen a set of guidelines conducive to

successful navigation of the court system. Based in and around the monarch's living spaces, the "court was at the center of a matrix of relations, political and economic, religious and artistic . . . it was the centre of patronage and a forum for politics; thus, gaining a position at court and maintaining it was vital in order for early modern political and cultural actors to succeed" (Constantinidou 598). In this system, "the golden key to political power . . . was access to the monarch. Personal contact with the king or queen provided the opportunity to seek grants or influence policy" (Shephard 723). In order to get noticed and acquire political or cultural capital, courtiers worked tirelessly to construct and maintain a self-image that pleased the ruler and curried his or her favor. These individuals worked to gain a favored position not only through their own performances, but also by outdoing a rival in flattery, loyalty, knowledge and usefulness, political prowess, or artistic ability. Since a bad performance would cost favor and influence, courtiers needed to avoid provocations to any destabilizing feelings and subsequent outbursts that could upend their carefully maintained images. Courtiers also might need to opportunistically adopt different affective postures in order to ascend the hierarchical ladder, or to avoid a ruinous descent. Since displacement could engender affective states conducive to self-preserving or self-advancing objectives, courtiers might have understood it as a crucial tool to ensure survival or success. Shakespeare's plays offer copious examples illustrating these two uses for displacement. In *King Lear,* Goneril and Regan ascend the courtly ladder because they perform an inauthentic filial piety that garners favor with their father King Lear, which in turn facilitates their ouster of Cordelia and subsequent consolidation of political power. In *Hamlet*, Hamlet fails to exhibit proper deference to King Claudius and his mother Queen Gertrude, which results in his loss of courtly favor because it marks his discontent and arouses suspicion at his

behavior. Examples such as these likely appeared to courtiers as evidence illustrating the usefulness of the Senecan-inspired approach to performative affect management.

Part II: Humoral Theory and Senecan Affect Management

Senecan delay and displacement changed very little in the early modern period, as evidenced by how Thomas Wright and Robert Burton adopt them as they appear in *De Ira*. But though these concepts remained unchanged, the influence of Galenic theory drastically altered the ontological understanding of emotion to which they were applied. Before moving on to discuss the way Senecan affect management tools reappear in Wright and Burton, we should review Galen's influence on early modern humoral theory and thus chart the differences between Senecan and early modern affective phenomenologies. First, the prevalent model of affect in early modern medicine was a worldview called humoral theory. This paradigm was popularized by the Greek doctor Hippocrates and his Roman commentator Galen, and it stipulated that one's bodily temperament and overall health was determined by a balance of four internal fluids called humors. These humors were blood, phlegm, yellow bile, and black bile. Each of the four humors was associated with one of the four elements (air, water, fire, earth) and a certain internal status (hot, cold, wet, dry). Because humors held elemental charges, it was thought they were influenced by temperature and other elementally charged objects from the outside world. Galen's treatise *The Best Constitution Of Our Bodies* explains that "external influences" such as stimuli causing one to be "heated, cooled, moistened, or dried beyond the appropriate level" (292) can produce "ill-humored bodies" which are prone to "domination by the causes of disease" (293). In addition to temperature, intake also manipulated humoral balance. After penetrating or being

imbibed by the body, elementally charged objects, including food, liquids, and vapors, would be "converted . . . into humors . . . substances that constitute organic beings and retain the properties of the elements that give rise to them. In a living body, fire yields yellow bile; air becomes blood; earth becomes black bile; and water yields phlegm" (Greenwood 30). These correspondences between external elemental affiliation and internal substance meant that the Galenic body was conceived as a malleable object prone to changes incurred from external forces.

Ultimately, the idea of the porous body inspired Galen to take an approach to medicine that emphasized an individual's responsibility to manage the humoral fluids circulating through their bodies. In *The Art of Medicine*, Galen contends that bodies are "subject to change, loss, and reversal . . . if the body were not subject to influence and change, the best constitution would endure forever, and there would be no need of an art to watch over it" (374). His program of health emphasized one's responsibility to monitor the changing status of the body and take steps to maintain an appropriate humoral balance. Bodies enervated by humoral inconsistencies would be prescribed regimens assumed to return the humors to a proper state. These curative measures included "change and voiding": "change" refers to an internal manipulation of the humors "by certain faculties of drugs," while "voiding" occurs though "purgations, enemas, sweats, and vomiting" (392). Galen theorized that such modifications to humoral balance influenced not only health and sickness, but also physical and personality traits. His two-book taxonomy *Mixtures* begins a codification of personality types based on humor, a schema of identity suggesting that material interiority influenced appearance and personality traits. In "Another Look at Chaucer and the Physiognomists," JB Friedman explains that Galen's ideas about personality types would extend outward from their origin point in modern-day Turkey and become more complex over

time. He explains that as time passed, evolutions of Galenic theory would cause individuals to understand that "bodily state, understood as the balance or imbalance of the four humors . . .would cause a person to look and behave in certain ways, tend towards certain occupations, and flourish or languish in certain seasons, when certain planets dominated" (141). Eventually, the early moderns would come to conceive that "the predominance of yellow bile (fire, hot and dry) leads to choleric behavior. The prevalence of blood (air, hot and moist) yields militancy and courage. When phlegm controls (water, moist and cold), passivity prevails; and the dominance of black bile (earth, cold and dry) causes melancholy" (Greenwood 30-32). And since the humoral body was conceived as porous and subject to influence from the outside world, the personality traits and emotional dispositions associated with each type might change or be manipulated in accord with or in spite of one's will.

By depicting interplay between the body and the world and articulating humoral personality types, Galen set the foundation for an early modern emotional economy predicated on a continuous exchange of shared matter between the self and the world. In the early modern period, philosophers and religious authorities would complicate Galen's primarily physiological model by factoring in a powerful emphasis on Christian morality, accounting for religious doctrine's influence on feeling. This addition thus overlaid a metaphysical element to the more material Galenic regime. It ultimately shaped the early modern emotional ecology into a structure consisting of multiple intersecting elements: a conscious self informed by intellect reason operating from, in many cases, a Christian perspective; a material self that continually responded to humoral fluctuation; and the outside world which caused humoral fluctuation through its myriad external stimuli. Because this model synthesizes the conscious self, the bodily self, and the external world, it means that movements in one beget corresponding movements in

the others. Such a model often pits the material and conscious selves against each other. Since the material self could be altered by external influences, it commonly produced unwanted urges or dispositions that conflicted with familial, cultural, moral, or religious obligations. The rational self was thus preoccupied with maintaining emotional equilibrium, as it was often forced to govern or reconcile a "disordered, undisciplined self subject to a variety of internal and external forces" (Schoenfeldt 12). In this model, the rational self may view the material self as a "site of subjugation" and potentially a "subject of horror" that had to be resisted and subdued (12). The desire to correct tension between the rational self and the humoral self, then, was a powerful force motivating the early modern subject's constant attention to issues of emotional management.

Wright, Burton, and other early modern intellectual authorities found that tools from Seneca could help negotiate the tension between the humoral self and the rational. In their original Senecan form, delay and displacement were mental protocols that leveraged the mind's ultimate control over affect. But in the early modern period, delay and displacement became crucial guidelines for performative behavior that conditioned the Galenic body away from an unwanted or dangerous affective state. Adapted to humoral theory, delay and displacement offered an opportunity to produce feelings not based on automatic physiological activity, but through actions predicated on individual reasoning or ethical considerations. Wright and Burton were likely exposed to the Senecan principles of delay and displacement through opposite programs of study. The Jesuit priest Wright seems to have encountered Senecan affective management not through sustained engagement with Seneca's moral treatises themselves, but through the powerful residual impact that these works exerted on two of the Catholic Church's two most important theologians: St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas. Having read and agreed

with Stoic and Senecan accounts of the pre-passions, these two church fathers accommodated them to Christian moral philosophy. Because the Stoics understood the pre-passions through the context of their own non-theistic, materialist cosmology, Augustine and Aquinas integrated the pre-passions into Christian dogma by determining how Christians might be "held responsible for this unpredictable and uncontrollable affective reaction" (Wu 476). Aquinas read Senecan moral treatises while working through this issue[4]. Along the way, he discovered an ethical system that emphasized "self-improvement and mental shaping" and resulted in a "moral compass . . . of near total self-determination" (Parvini 97). These Senecan discussions of moral vigilance would inform Aquinas's conclusion about the pre-passions. In Aquinas's view, Christians were indeed morally culpable for involuntary movements toward feeling because they had recourse to fortify their minds against affective impulses that could provoke temptation. In other words, Christians needed to invest in preventative maintenance against pre-passions, since pious meditation and religious practice could disincline one to negative affects and sinful thoughts[5]. However, like Seneca, Aquinas advocates for a system of preventative maintenance that would give the self some ability to forestall or prevent negative affect[6]. Combined with increasing attention to the complexity of the humoral economy, these influences from Seneca and Aquinas would take hold during the early modern period to engender a "psychological notion of a struggle within the self, of the will battling with a passion such as anger" (Parvini 96). Partly through his Jesuit scholastic training and partly as a participant in the contemporary discourse on emotion, Thomas Wright understood Senecan affect management and incorporated it into *Passions of the Mind in General*[7].

Unlike Wright, Burton consumed Seneca more directly, thanks to a university curriculum that deployed classical texts to train students in logic and philosophy[8]. Burton took degrees from

the Oxford system in 1602 (BA) and 1605 (MA), and remained at the school as a librarian until his death in 1640. His training in classical texts must have imparted a special esteem for Seneca, as he cites Seneca by name over fifty times in *The Antatomy of Melancholy*, always in a praising manner. The preface to *The Anatomy of Melancholy,* told from the perspective of the philosopher-narrator character Democritus Junior, betrays this unwavering appreciation for Seneca and his contributions to intellectual culture. Though Democritus acknowledges that a few critics censured Seneca, he calls the Stoic philosopher a "superintendent of wit, learning, judgment . . . the best of Greek and Latin writers in Plutarch's opinion" ("Democritus Junior to the Reader, 29). Other places in the text offer the same consistent praise for Seneca's intellect and appeals to Senecan logic. The text's admiration for Seneca makes sense, given that *The Anatomy of Melancholy* appears after a nationwide revival and reassessment of Seneca enshrined Senecan texts at the highest levels of intellectual and artistic culture. This movement began in the mid-sixteenth century, when scholastic circles expressed "intense interest in [Seneca], especially at the universities and inns of court, where members translated most of the drama and performed a series of Neo-Senecan plays" (Winston 150). Many of the scholars who reappraised and elevated Seneca also doubled as magistrates and political councilors, injecting Senecan ideas into Elizabethan intellectual and political consciousness[9]. The student cohorts trained during and after this widespread appreciation of Seneca took hold – in the 1560s, 70s, and 80s – would have occupied teaching positions in the Oxford university system in 1593, when Robert Burton enrolled in the undergraduate curriculum at Brasenose College. Burton's esteem for Seneca was likely inherited from the intellectual authorities who shaped his university education.

Championed by the Catholic Wright, the Anglican Burton, and other intellectual authorities of the day, strategies first articulated by Seneca formed the core of early modern

affect management. A close analysis of *Passions of the Mind in General* and *The Anatomy of Melancholy* reveals Seneca's vast influence over early modern regimens for humoral governance; these texts define delay and displacement almost verbatim to *De Ira*, and then apply them to a Galenic paradigm. Seneca's understanding of delay appears in *Passions of the Mind in General*, which also claims that one afflicted by passion should forestall action, lest they act out impetuously and ruinously. Wright acknowledges delay by asserting that in cases of extreme perturbation, "it were not good to make any resolution or determination of change, for some I have seen so vehement in their passions that whatsoever was suggested to them . . . they presently put into execution" (Wright 155). To convey the importance of avoiding rash action, Wright explains how the philosopher Athenodorus counseled Augustus Caesar to avoid anger by abstaining from "anything before he had recited the four and twenty letters of the Greek alphabet" (156). Like Seneca before him, Wright maintains that such dilatory tactics will cause unwanted affective impulses to "in short time . . . vanish away . . . either because the humor which was moved returneth to its former seat, or the impression made in the imagination diminisheth, or the attention of the soul distracted with other matters faileth" (158). Wright's understanding of delay's effectiveness differs from Seneca's because of the epistemological context in which it appears. While Seneca believes that delay works because it allows the mind time to recover its right reason, Wright finds delay effective because it allows the body time to correct a humoral imbalance. Wright's definition of delay reflects the way that Senecan principles were adapted to a humoral paradigm where mental governance wielded less power over affect than Seneca had previously conceptualized.

Of the two Senecan-inspired strategies for affect management, displacement was more widely discussed as the early modern subject's strongest recourse against errant and destabilizing

humors. Delay often acts as the first step towards displacement, as it provides a window in which the conscious self has time to institute a performative regimen conducive to a desired affective state. Though delay offers this foundation for displacement, Wright and Burton focus more intently on displacement because it better emphasizes an individual's autonomy through their choice to adopt alternate feelings. Wright and Burton therefore position displacement as the most effective method for curbing untoward, disorderly affect. Wright tells readers that "if thou perceive a vehement inclination to the one extreme, procure to bend thyself as far to the other, for thou shalt come to the midst . . . by the example of a crooked staff, the which to make straight we bend to the other side" (Wright 150). He calls this strategy for manipulating affect "one of the most forcible and important remedies that men can use" (152). Given that "contrary acts" imbue the soul with "certain habits, helps, stays, or inclinations most opposite unto our passions," Wright suggests that continually practicing displacement can eliminate one's susceptibility to negative affects while instilling positive ones (152). In other words, daily prayerful or behavioral implementation of humility, temperance, and chastity can help reduce occasions to dangerous feelings such as pride, anger, and lust. Wright lists some specific meditative and performative acts capable of displacing negative affects with positive ones, including: "fly[ing] occasions which may incense the passions whereunto we are inclined" (150-51); "divert[ing] the thoughts to some other object" (153); "bridl[ing] the body . . . fasting, praying, laying hard, coarse shirts" (153); and as a last resort for when "thy passions are most vehement . . . seek for succor for Heaven, fly under the wings of Christ" (154). These instructions reflect how early modern subjects came to see meditation and activity as methodologies for determining their affective dispositions. Like Seneca, who advises readers to attain self-mastery through conscious thought

and behavior, Wright similarly advocates for a behavioral regimen that disciplines inward feeling to make it compatible with moral or religious reasoning.

Like Seneca and Wright before him, Burton also champions displacement as an important remedy against unwanted affect. He asserts that when dealing with "passions so headstrong that no reason, art, counsel, or persuasion . . . may shake them off," one must "oppose, fortify, or prepare himself against them by premeditation, reason, or as we do a crooked staff, bend himself another way . . . recreate the mind by some contrary object." (2.2.105). In addition to borrowing Wright's staff comparison[10], Burton quotes *De Ira* 2.12 to further define displacement: "As he that useth an upright shoe may correct the obliquity or crookedness by wearing it on the other side, we may overcome passions if we will. *Quicquid sibi imperavit animus obtinuit* (as Seneca saith): *nulli tam feri affectus, ut non disciplina perdomentur*" (2.2.106). Here, Burton translates Seneca's Latin as "whatsoever the will desires, she may command: no such cruel affections, but by disciplining they may be tamed" (2.2.106). This translation reflects a unique nuance of the humoral system. In contrast to the Senecan affective model where mental discipline alone manipulates affect, Burton's use of "disciplining" implies his understanding of how affect must be changed through a cooperative effort between mind and body. He gives examples of this cooperation, explaining how "in an ague the appetite would drink; sore eyes that itch would be rubbed; but reason saith no, and therefore the moving faculty will not do it . . . 'Imagination enforceth spirits, which . . . compel the nerves to obey, and they our several limbs" (2.2.107). Here, Burton identifies that "disciplining" begins with a mental decision that directs the body, compelling it to perform or abstain from a particular activity. The body's behavior then causes physiological effects that reinforce the original decision on a material level. In other words, Burton's translation indentifies how implementing a physical regimen can orient the early

modern body toward desired affective outcomes. In this way, the mind can recruit the body to help it accomplish moral objectives. This recruitment involves commanding the body to perform a particular action, one which in turn changes the body on a physiological level to encourage the desired results.

In addition to clarifying how delay and displacement can help one manage individual affective inclinations, Wright and Burton also claim that subjects can use these methods to transfer an affective charge onto another body or out into the larger environment. *De Ira* provides a foundation for this idea. Though he counts it "a blessing . . . to escape from anger, that chief of evils," Seneca recognizes that performing anger or another negative feeling may serve as the catalyst to a positive affective outcome (2.12). He argues that "we may sometimes affect to be angry when we wish to rouse the dull minds of those whom we address, just as we rouse up horses who are slow at starting with goads and firebrands. We must sometimes apply fear to persons upon whom reason makes no impression" (2.14). While Seneca believes that the appearance of anger might occasionally help a skilled rhetorician push "the dull minds of those whom we address" toward a proper decision, Wright and Burton embrace performative affect because they believe it produces humor that situates the body toward a corresponding affective state. For example, Wright praises the anecdotal example of a certain "Christian orator" with intimate understanding of "the natures and properties of men's passions" (Wright 90). Because this orator is "himself . . . extremely passionate" and knows "the Art of moving the affections of . . . auditors," he can make his listeners "shed an abundance of tears" or "turn their sorrows into laughter" (90). In this instance, Wright extols the "godly preacher" who uses passions as "a means to help us" (89-90). Burton concurs that a "good orator alone . . . can alter the affections by power of his eloquence . . . 'comfort such that are afflicted, erect such as are depressed, expel

and mitigate fear, lust, anger, ect.'" (2.2.113) Like Wright, Burton gives these individuals a pass if they use affective manipulation for the greater good, specifically condoning physicians who cure madmen though "some feigned lie, strange news, witty device, artificial invention. It is not amiss to deceive them" (2.2.114). These examples illustrate that according to humoral theory, performative affect management not only allows the individual to counteract their own unwanted feelings, but to make positive changes in others through affective transmission. By modeling or even simply discoursing on virtuous behavior, the morally-minded early modern subject could spread an appropriate affective mood and therefore exercise powerful agency over the environment.

Taken together, delay, displacement, and affective transmissibility answer the aforementioned question posed by Robert Burton: How might anyone resist the affective inclinations to which they are "so inwardly disposed" because of their physiology? Affect management tools taken from Senecan philosophy gave early modern subjects the ability to resist and even change those humoral baselines often perceived as the dominant influence on period affect. Specifically, the routines adapted from Seneca's ideas of delay and displacement gave mentally-disciplined individuals a means to condition their bodies toward any alternative they might choose. These routines exploit the humoral body's malleability to suit the mind's purposes; they allow the mind to commence meditations or activities that begin altering body's humoral state in a desired way. Such routines, as recorded by Wright and Burton, meant the humoral body was not always a site of vulnerability and potential horror, as sometimes described by the first wave of scholars studying early modern affect[11]. Instead, practitioners of performative affect management likely understood their humoral bodies in a dialectical way, given that they could also serve as conduits for self-determination. If governed by a strong mind,

the humoral body could be manipulated into an affective state that would facilitate one's intellectual, moral, or religious objectives.

Part III: Senecan Affect Management and *Hamlet*

Shakespeare himself understood the performative affect management routines inspired by Seneca and recorded by Wright and Burton. Additionally, because of his status as an eminent artist, he also would have had opportunities to read Latin editions of the Senecan philosophical texts which inspired Wright and Burton, including *De Ira.* At the start of Shakespeare's career in the late 1580s and early 1590s, scholars, playwrights, and other educated parties facilitated a Neo-Stoic revival by reading and discussing Latin-language versions of Seneca's moral treatises. Curtis Perry notes that *De Ira*'s first English translation was completed by Thomas Lodge in 1614, but maintains that "there is no reason to assume that this would have prevented a curious writer from accessing it in Latin earlier" (422). In fact, Perry discusses key points of evidence suggesting "something of a vogue for Seneca's philosophical works" around 1600 (422). He points to John Marston's *Antonio's Revenge*, published and performed at the turn of the century, as indicative of intellectual exchange between early modern dramatists and Senecan moral treatises. This revenge play "makes sustained and overt use of both Senecan tragedy and Senecan philosophical works" (416), including a Latin quotation from *De Prouidentia* "about the importance of fortitude" (417). Marston's interest in Sencan moral philosophy might reflect a broader interest among other playwrights given the competitive and collaborative nature of the dramatic scene[12]. The stationer Edward Blount, an important publisher of native drama and literature in translation, secured the right to print "a complete translation of Seneca's

philosophical works" in April 1600 (422). Blount had a sense of "drama as an emergent literary form" and had published luminaries such as "Marlowe, Montaigne, Cervantas, and Shakespeare" (Kastan 62). Though Lodge was the first individual to publish an English version of *De Ira*, Blount's earlier interest suggests that Latin versions of Senecan philosophy made rounds among scholars and artists years before they first appeared in English language editions. Since these Senecan texts were essential to early modern scholastic curricula and theatrical fashion, it remains plausible that Shakespeare could have directly encountered Senecan treatises including *De Ira* through his activity in intellectual and dramatic circles of exchange.

It can't be directly proven that Shakespeare read *De Ira*, but *Hamlet* reflects that he at the very least had internalized Senecan-inspired rules for performative affect management. Specifically, I argue that *Hamlet* serves to illustrate displacement; it reads as a fictionalized portrayal of a humoral subject who implements Wright and Burton's advice to remake one's default affective state by performing a desired opposite. Understanding that Hamlet deliberately practices this style of affect management helps demystify the longstanding scholarly and popular controversies surrounding his mental clarity and consistency. Phoebe Spinrad offers a broad synopsis of these debates, explaining that the body of Hamlet criticism "seems unable to decide" what Hamlet's "state of mind may be, variously describing Hamlet as consistently religious, consistently secular in his humanism, consistently rational, consistently mad and thus not responsible for anything he says by the end of the play, or so consistently inconsistent as to be a protopostmodernist in his own right" (453). Reading Hamlet as a practitioner of displacement helps resolve notions of affective inconsistency on his part. At certain points of the play, Hamlet seems to concurrently embody contradictory states of feeling. Because the humoral body might be led in opposite directions by internal or external stimuli, such affective ambivalence is not

totally abnormal. But more importantly, Hamlet resolves this ambivalence though the consistent desire to will himself into a bolder mentality that can displace his initial circumspection. He achieves this change through deliberate, performative choices that work to supplant hesitancy with boldness and militancy. These performative choices rely on the humoral body's malleability, as Hamlet conditions his humor into sanguinity by forcing himself to think about and act like other figures who – in his mind – best model the avenging agency he wishes to emulate. He chooses two specific figures as models: Pyrrhus, a classical example of regicidal wrath, and his male rivals Fortinbras and Laertes, both of whom demonstrate the type of masculine agency necessary to avenge a father. By using these figures as guides that help him perform a desired affective state, Hamlet demonstrates the mind's ability to set a regimen that can determine feeling by reconditioning the humoral body.

Hamlet's behavior during the plays first and second acts do not reflect a wholly sanguine or choleric humoral state. Acts I and I see Hamlet building toward the anger associated with these humors, but a level of caution prevents his intellect from fully committing to vengeful thoughts and violent reprisal against the "smiling, damned villain" currently occupying Denmark's royal seat (1.5.106). After encountering the Ghost and contemplating the apparition's command to "remember me" (1.5.91), Hamlet concludes that "time is out of joint – O cursed spite, / That I was ever born to set it right" (1.5.188-89). At this point in the play, Hamlet's desire for revenge struggles against unresolved doubts and religious scruples that prevent him from fully trusting the specter. Because the devil "hath power / T' assume a pleasing shape, yea, and perhaps . . . abuses to damn me" (2.2.599-603), Hamlet delays full commitment to a revenging disposition until he first uses "The Murther of Gonzago" to "catch the conscience of a king" (2.2.605). The play-within-a-play and the aborted trip to England thus mark a change in

Hamlet's relationship to his own affect. While the Hamlet of Acts I and II seems melancholy because he delays acting out of anger due to circumspection and religious sentiments, the Hamlet of Acts III, IV, and V acts with choler and sanguinity. Despite not killing Claudius at the confessional in Act III, Hamlet nonetheless exhibits an impressive amount of choleric impetuosity and sanguine courage: he kills Polonius behind the arras, escapes from pirates and dupes his would-be assassins, jumps into Ophelia's grave with Laertes, and participates in the final duel. These actions show that in Acts IV and V, Hamlet has become the audacious avenger he openly wishes to become in Acts I and II. Once his doubts about the Ghost's truthfulness are removed and Claudius's evil comes to light – notably through the attempt on his life – Hamlet fully embraces affect management strategies that strengthen his resolve and enable feats of daring. Most prominent among these strategies is Hamlet's engagement with theatrical models of choleric and sanguine affect, which begins before he fully commits to revenge.

In conversation with the First Player, Hamlet demonstrates a mental agency that conditions his body toward a desired affective state. Namely, he begins reciting and then asks the First Player to finish a speech romanticizing the brutal Trojan War exploits of Pyrrhus, the son of Achilles who executed King Priam during the sacking of Troy. Hamlet's investment in Pyrrhus reflects a conscious desire to guide his affective state toward vengeful ire. By giddily retelling and then eagerly listening to this tale of murderous rage, Hamlet uses performative thought and action to nurture a reservoir of anger that may help achieve revenge despite obstacles to the contrary. His investment in the story reflects the way early modern authorities understood the affective resonance of plays, books, and other artistic objects. Authorities including Wright and Burton maintained that "books and plays were among the external agents capable of profoundly altering humoral balance, implicating readers and theatergoers in complex processes of

transaction or exchange" (Craik and Pollard 7). Wright argues that "corrupted books" possess a "silent persuasion" that "insinuate[s] their matter unto the chief affectation and highest part of the Soul" (326-27). In a special address to "'passion movers,' such as poets and orators, Wright advises them to bear in mind the potentially hazardous impact of their words, and to 'imitate herein the common practice of prudent physicians, who apply their medicine to the same maladies with particular . . . consideration of the patient's temper" (Craik and Pollard 17). Hamlet behaves like Wright's physician, as he assesses his humoral state, determines that he wants to eliminate melancholy, and then prescribes a physiological cure for the melancholy humors contributing to the inactivity he displays up to this point. Hamlet's cure consists of participating in recitative and theatrical exercises depicting anger. Given that "'anger stirs choler, heats the blood and the vital spirits'" (Burton 2.2.103), performing Pyrrhus's anger alongside the First Player allows Hamlet to generate a strong resolve that displaces melancholy.

While inviting the First Player to speak on Pyrrhus, Hamlet uses language that seems to represent the intensity of his yet-unrealized, violent inclinations against Claudius. He directs the First Player to begin Aeneas' tale to Dido right at "Priam's slaughter" (2.2.448), as "o'er-sized with coagulate gore . . . the hellish Pyrrhus / Old grandsire Priam seeks" (2.2.462-64). Hamlet's description of Pyrrhus incorporates blood to emphasize the Greek warrior's terrifying capacity for violent action. In Hamlet's mind, Pyrrhus appears with "sable arms" that are "black as his purpose" (2.2.452-53); his whole body exudes a "black complexion smear'd" by the "blood of fathers, mothers, daughters, sons" (2.2.458). Especially given his elite education at Wittenberg, Hamlet likely understands that Galenic medicine positioned blood as a palliative for melancholy and a catalyst for action. Paster notes that early modern medicine recommended "drinking animal or human blood . . . as a curative for states like sorrow, which cooled and dried the body .

. . the heat of the new blood would contain courage . . . transmitted to the drinker when ingested" (56). Hamlet's rhetorical and performative exercise seems designed to build toward the heightened courage bestowed by the consumption of blood. By rendering Pyrrhus in such gory terms, Hamlet approximates this period cure for sorrow; he drinks in the imagery of blood spilled by Pyrrhus, rather than drinking any actual blood. This performance reflects the principles of Senecan displacement, since it works to replace sadness with an increased appetite for symbolic and real blood. In the next act, Hamlet demonstrates this increased appetite by exclaiming that he "could drink hot blood, / And do such [bitter business] as the day / Would quake to look on" (3.2.390-91). Hamlet's declaration here indicates what Paster calls the "burgeoning of a desire to be ready physiologically and psychologically for an outburst of rage against his mother and for sudden physical action (like stabbing through an arras)" (58). Because Hamlet creates this desire through conscious strategies of affect management, it reflects his level of agentic participation in humoral ecology.

In a reflection of the complexity of affective ecology, Hamlet's deliberate movements toward anger in 2.2 and 3.2 are not enough to compel him to take immediate revenge when he has the opportunity at Claudius's confessional. His desire for reprisal competes with other elements informing his affective disposition. These elements include his uncertainty about the Ghost and its claims, a desire to interrogate his mother before plotting a course of action, and the Christian cosmological views that influence his understanding of how and when to best revenge upon Claudius. The tension between these competing motivators manifests fully in 3.3, when Hamlet rationalizes his decision to leave Claudius undisturbed while praying. As he overhears the unwitting Claudius admit to "a brother's murther" (3.3.37), Hamlet acknowledges that "I might do it, now'a is a-praying; / And now I'll do't" (3.3.73-74). Hearing this admission of guilt

alleviates Hamlet's concerns about the Ghost's authenticity, but his other two concerns remain. He still wishes to verbally chastise Gertrude for acquiescing to Claudius's suit, and then use her reaction to decide how he might treat her as the revenge plot moves forward. In the best case scenario – as ends up happening – contrition from Gertrude will help Hamlet follow the Ghost's command to "Taint not thy mind, nor let thy soul contrive / Against thy mother" (1.5.85-86). In addition to his preoccupation with his mother, religious sentiments also stop Hamlet from an impetuous revenge. Even though Claudius admits that his sins are not forgiven because he still possesses "those effects for which I did the murther: / My crown, mine own ambition, and my queen" (3.3.54-55), Hamlet assumes that killing Claudius "in the purging of his soul, / When he is fit and season'd for his passage" would send him to heaven (3.3.85-86). To Hamlet, the more appropriately brutal revenge would be murdering the King in a more explicitly sinful state, perhaps "when he is drunk asleep, or in his rage, / Or in th' incestuous pleasure of his bed . . . about some act / That has no relish of salvation in it" (3.3.89-92). Achieving a revenge that guarantees Claudius a ticket to hell seems more aligned to the type of ruthless reprisal that arrests Hamlet's imagination. However, in a paradox created by his religious convictions, Hamlet believes that he can only properly punish Claudius when aided by the right moment, which reduces his efficacy as a revenger.

The religious concerns that stay Hamlet's hand totally disappear in Act V, after he survives Claudius's assassination plot. But even before this point, Hamlet's begins to work past the mental blocks slowing his revenge. His rhetoric in Acts IV and V begins to focus less on reasons against revenge, and more on meditations encouraging readiness. Before departing for England, Hamlet passes the Norwegian prince Fortinbras marching south with a host of troops. Observing this march to war inspires Hamlet to compare himself to Fortinbras, which elicits the

reaction against the First Player in 2.2. In Hamlet's mind, Fortinbras and the First Player both share a quality that he lacks: the ability to quickly and easily adopt a desired affective condition. Hamlet seethes in 2.2 because he cannot mimic the way the First Player "force[s] his soul so to his own conceit . . . all for nothing, / For Hecuba! What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba, / That he should weep for her?" (2.2.553-60). And Hamlet again feels inferior in 4.4 because he watches Fortinbras march with "divine ambition puff'd" and make "mouths at the invisible event . . . How stand I then / That have a father kill'd, a mother stain'd, / Excitements of my reason and my blood, / And let all sleep" (4.4.49-59). Emboldened by the certainty of Claudius's guilt and the example set by Fortinbras, Hamlet declares that "from this time forth, / My thoughts be bloody, or be nothing worth" (4.4.65-66). In declaring that his "thoughts" rather than "actions" will be bloody, Hamlet suggests the possibility that his streak of inactivity may continue. But in Act 5, while telling Horatio the story of surviving Claudius's assassination plot, Hamlet offers a new governing intent that supercedes his old religious concerns. He declares that Claudius must be killed quickly because he:

> Hath kill'd my king and whor'd my mother,
>
> Popp'd in between th' election and my hopes,
>
> Thrown out his angle for my proper life,
>
> And with such coz'nage - is't not perfect conscience
>
> To quit him with his arm? And is't not to be damn'd,
>
> To let this canker of our nature come / In further evil?

This speech sees Hamlet add a new item to his list of grievances against Claudius: the plot that took aim at "my proper life." When Hamlet acknowledges that "perfect conscience" might require him to speedily dispatch Claudius "with this arm," he acknowledges that his own physical and spiritual safety depends on being the first to achieve revenge. His assertion that leaving Claudius alive is "to be damned" sounds like a hyperbolic moral declaration. But it also refers to Hamlet's new awareness that he might still be suddenly killed by his enemy, in a way that does not allow for him to control his soul's condition before death. This drive for self-preservation likely takes precedent over his desire to orchestrate revenge in a specific way, ultimately pushing Hamlet past his previous arguments against revenge.

Upon his return to court, Hamlet's affective trajectory shifts toward a stronger embrace of sanguinity and choler. By consciously nurturing his ire, Hamlet illustrates a pattern common to early modern avengers, many of whom also deploy meditative meditative and performative methods to strengthen their ire and compel their humoral bodies toward revenge. Hamlet's fellow avengers often use physical objects or tokens that remind them of the injuries they've suffered: Hieronimo in *The Spanish Tragedy* keeps Horatio's bloody handkerchief as a reminder of his revenge mission against Lorenzo and Balthazar; Vindice in *The Revenger's Tragedy* keeps the skull of his slain lover Gloriana and mediates on it before murdering the Duke who killed her. These objects are kept to stir the revenger's mind to thoughts of enmity and retaliation, which in turn would condition the body to produce choler and blood. Hamlet keeps no such physical token, but likewise employs deliberate methods to maintain a physiological state conducive to bold action. He specifically chooses to imitate the closest model of courageous male agency, his prospective brother-in-law Laertes. In imitating Laertes, Hamlet illustrates how, in Evelyn Tribble's words, "early modern playwrights and players were keenly aware of the

susceptibility of audiences to the affective states of others" (Tribble 95). Tribble explains this susceptibility by quoting the anti-theatricalist Stephen Gosson, who opines against the morally destructive potentiality of theatre-going. Gosson feels particularly threatened by the group setting of the theatre, arguing that the playgoing audience "mindlessly melds into one body, as laughter and shouting spread like a pathogen, stirring up 'affectations,' which are naturally planted in that part of the minde that is common to us with brute beasts'" (197). As an admirer and student of the theatre, Hamlet likely understands this relationship and uses it to his advantage. He seizes the opportunity to observe and imitate Laertes, thus using spectatorship and performance to condition his body towards his desired affective state.

Hamlet's choice to imitate Laertes seems natural, given that the two young noblemen share similar circumstances that inspire similar affective responses. Richard Strier explains that Hamlet perceives Laertes not as a foil or rival, but "as a kind of double. He says this explicitly with regard to their situations; they have both lost their fathers unexpectedly, and Hamlet can easily, by reflection, project himself into Laertes: 'By the image of my cause I see / The portraiture of his' (5.2.76)" (29). Because he mirrors Hamlet's position as an aspiring avenger, Laertes also mirrors the affective state that Hamlet wishes to adopt. Laertes exhibits the revenger's anger and grief at Ophelia's grave, belittling the priest who abstains from singing a requiem for the departed and cursing the offender whose "wicked deed thy most ingenious sense / Deprived thee of!" (5.1.248). While watching Laertes, Hamlet remembers that he must perform these same feelings in his own quest for revenge and the psychic satisfaction it ostensibly brings. As he audaciously bursts in upon the mourning party, Hamlet immediately establishes that he wishes to engage with Laertes in a competition of performative affect. He asks: "What is he whose grief . . . Conjures the wand'ring stars and makes them stand / Like wonder-wounded

hearers?" (5.1.254-57) Answering his own question, Hamlet declares that it is not Laertes but "I, Hamlet the Dane!" who emotes the most impactful grief (5.1.259). During their struggle, Hamlet continues to emphasize his willingness to outdo Laertes in terms of magnitude of affect. Determined to "fight with him upon this theme / Until my eyelids no longer wag" (5.1.267), Hamlet declares that he's ready to weep, fight, or even eat a crocodile to prove that he can "rant as well as thou" (5.1.284). Hamlet's readiness to elevate the intensity of his performance illustrates that he understands affect through a theatrical lens. By observing, imitating, and outdoing another performer, Hamlet can act his feelings into being. Reflecting on the incident with Horatio, Hamlet admits that inspiration from and emulation of Laertes amplifies his feelings: "The bravery of his grief did put me / Into a tow'ring passion" (5.2.79-80). When Hamlet explains that Laertes's grief put him "into a tow'ring passion," he suggests that proximity to Laertes's performance stirred up similar affective charges in his humoral body. But by following up on these impulses by jumping into the grave, Hamlet begins a performance that ultimately serves the same purpose as his engagement with Pyrrhus. Both his imitation of Laertes and his exchange with the First Player are behavioral acts designed to condition the body toward a revenging disposition.

Conclusion: Not so Melancholy

The Hamlet of Acts IV and V seems a different person than the Hamlet of Acts I, II, and III. Instead of frantically querying his affective conditions and excoriating himself for not exhibiting the appropriate feelings, Hamlet in Acts IV and V demonstrates a subdued but determined resolve. He exudes a calm and quiet comfort with his decision to eliminate the

usurper Claudius. Hamlet expresses this steady clarity and constant affective state through spiritual language, declaring that there's a "divinity that shapes our ends, / Rough-hew them how we will" (5.2.9-11) and that there is "a special providence in the fall of a sparrow" (5.2.9-11). But despite Hamlet's focus on the spiritual in these lines, the new confidence he exhibits comes in significant part from his understanding of the material and the physiological. Because Hamlet understands how meditation and behavior can set the impressionable humoral body toward a desired affective state, he can easily maintain faith in the performative regimen he sets for himself. Hamlet's appreciation of theatre informs his knowledge of performative affect management, as it predisposes him to implement the meditative and behavioral practices first discussed by Seneca and later adapted to early modern humoral paradigms by authorities such as Thomas Wright and Robert Burton. Hamlet's implementation of performative affect management means that he is not melancholy by nature. Instead, we observe Hamlet as he works to interrogate and determine his feelings, despite the multiplicity of external factors influencing his affective state by default.

Because he works through a theatrical lens, Hamlet aptly illustrates that early modern affect management was understood though the language of performance. Wright and Burton implicitly acknowledge that theatrical metaphors were eminently appropriate for discussions of affect management, as they often refer to actors and orators in their adaptations of Senecan delay and displacement. Like these example figures presented by Wright and Burton, Hamlet also manages his affect with a judicious eye towards its reception by others. By his own admission, Hamlet is "essentially not in madness, / But mad in craft" (3.4.187-88) because he wishes to confuse enemies "who would bring him on to some confession / Of his true state" (3.1.9-10). This reasoning would have especially resonated with the courtiers, who understood that adopting

an affective posture could serve either as necessary means of survival or a common method of advancement. In a broader sense, Hamlet's focus on court survival illustrates that class represents one narrow element in a collection of subject positions that combine to determine a revenger's affective program. In order to achieve the type of revenge he wants, Hamlet must manage his feelings in a way that befits his noble standing and the court rituals that come along with it. The next chapters will continue to focus on these varied elements that give shape to the revenger's individual affective program, which include family status, class, gender, religious beliefs, and socio-cultural expectations. In managing these elements to construct their own affect management regimens, revengers offer powerful evidence of the way a subject might use performative tools to intervene in the ecology of affect.

Chapter 2: Gendered Performances of Revenge

Part I: Introduction

Revenge narratives complicate the way that textual authorities like Wright and Burton orient their discussions of affect management toward Christian purposes. In contrast to the instructive treatises which extort readers to mollify dangerous affect in order to achieve better behavior and salvation, revenge texts paint a more robust picture of the ideological and individual concerns that influenced the early modern subject. A provocation to revenge forces the would-be avenger to take inventory of their various subjective positions, be it familial, gendered, religious, or socio-economic. Then, the avenging hopeful must assess whether or not they exhibit feelings and behavior befitting their statuses. If not, the avenger must do something – implementing an affect management routine, as Hamlet does – to feel and act in the appropriate way. Revenge plays, then, offer a site where we can observe Senecan affect management principles implemented for diverse applications. These applications show how a subject should emote not necessarily as a Christian seeking salvation, but as a distraught family member seeking redress for an injured loved one, an aggrieved noble seeking to maintain aristocratic pride and social position, or a man or woman seeking to behave according to the paradigms of gender. These concerns give a larger view of the distinct yet interrelated ideological layers motivating the revenger, thus helping to further John Kerrigan's important analysis of revengers as "questers after psychic balance as well as ethical equivalence . . . The poise of a revenge action can bear intricately asymmetrical relations to the psychic needs and personalities of A and B, or their agents" (10-11). The revenger's "psychic needs and personalities" are obviously reflected in the way they choose to mobilize affect in order to meet

the expectations put upon them as a gendered, familial, and socio-cultural, as well as religious, subject.

The texts written by Wright and Burton clearly outline the rules for performative affect management: wait out feelings that weaken your reason and might cause you to act out in a harmful way, and then control your emotional state by evicting unwanted feelings through other, more appropriate or useful feelings. However, these texts often make a morally correct but reductive assumption about their reading audiences: they assume readers want to learn performative affect management to aspire to perfect Christian morality. Burton argues that original sin afflicts humanity with "weakness" and "want of government," which makes humans prone to "several lusts . . . if we give the reigns to lust, anger ambition, pride, and follow our ways, we degenerate into beasts, transform ourselves, overthrow our constitution, provoke God to anger, and heap upon us . . . melancholy, and all kinds of incurable diseases, as a just and deserved punishment of our sins" (1.1.136-37). In this assessment, one who neglects to manage affect according to Christian morality incurs God's anger, which incurs further spiritual and physical punishment. Instead, proper affect management helps the Christian to a pious disposition that incurs better behavior and heavenly rewards. Wright depicts displacement as the key to unlock these rewards, positioning it as the first movement of an arc to salvation: "fear expelleth sin, sadness brings repentance, delight pricketh forward to keep God's commandments . . . passions are spurs that stir up sluggish and idle souls from slothfulness to diligence, from carelessness to consideration" (102). Here, Wright argues that a healthy fear of God removes the temptation to act out inordinate desires that motivate sin, and then delight at pleasing God then keeps these temptations away.

Although Wright and Burton explicitly oriented their texts to Christian morality, their works contain examples illustrating how performative affect management might be employed to accomplish secular objectives. One might condition the body toward an affective state that facilitates an appropriate gender performance, one's desired occupational results, or perhaps a social or financial achievement. In a discussion explaining how music pushes the body toward a corresponding affective state, Wright provides several examples of performative affect management being used for reasons other than spiritual salvation. He explains that "music and instruments in one kind causeth soldiers' blood to rise and thirst after the shedding of the blood of their enemies, so contrawise another sort of music pacifieth the minds of men, and rendereth them quiet and peaceable" (207). When Wright explains that music causes "blood to rise," he points to the automatic effect that an external stimuli – music – exerts on the impressionable humoral body. But if purposefully inserted into a context that calls for increased blood and vigor, such as a march into battle, music represents a deliberate stimulation of the body to better serve occupational and political purposes. In this case, the soldiers listening to the music are driven toward a physiological state conducive to bravery and bloodlust, which increases their fighting performance and boosts their chances of survival. This improvement also benefits the political actors commanding the soldiers, since they improve the efficacy of their human tools and thus increase the chance of accomplishing their political objectives. In another example of music's effects on physiology and feeling, Wright discusses the tactics used by beggars. He explains that because "passions . . . are moved by music, such as mercy and compassion . . . many beggars with songs demand their alms; and specifically the Germans, where the man, the wife, and their children make a full begging choir" (207). By emphasizing the elaborately staged nature of the German "begging choir," Wright again illustrates that a deliberate performance can successfully

influence affect to the benefit of a specific goal. In this case, the beggars accomplish their financial objectives by using song to put others in a pitying, generous mood.

Revenge narratives more robustly emphasize the varied applications of performative affect management, as they fully explore the gendered, familial, and socio-cultural priorities that also motivate affect management routines. Many revenge texts illustrate how these subject positions converge to create gender-specific affective scripts for revenge, which were significantly influenced by the intersection of Galenic medicine and hegemonic gender norms. The male revenge script demanded that men participate in retaliatory action in order to maintain their gendered and hierarchical positions, while the female script used humoral and cultural conceits to relegate women to inactive, ineffectual, or self-destructive roles in revenge. Lesel Dawson writes that "revenge narratives represent manliness as a highly prized commodity that individuals acquire through retaliatory acts of violence" (3). These acts of violence reify male selfhood and relation to the community, given that they offer opportunity to demonstrate loyalty to a family group or social faction through opposition to a rival group. Linda Woodbridge quotes Edward Muir's sweeping study of vendetta in early modern Italy to remind us that revenge "provided 'the crucial means by which individuals, especially males, formed their identities in imitation of heroic predecessors and in opposition to hereditary enemies' (Muir *xxvii – xxviii*). Grudge hatches history" (Woodbridge 50). Galenic medicine seemed to corroborate this active role for men by elevating male ability to act on sanguinity and choler over female ability to act on these same humors. Muir reviews the emotional phenomenology of the period to explain that:

> When sufficiently angered or provoked, a man's mad blood stirred, producing an irresistible flare of choler and anger, that emotion biologically induced by what we would call the fight response. Renaissance society greatly valued the fight over flight response;

> whereas fighting always produced risks, a failure to resist perceived antagonisms guaranteed shame, a social calamity perhaps more disastrous than any other for man's relations with his fellows, as shameful for him as impurity for a woman. Whatever the encouragements of Christian morality, a man best avoided shame and preserved honor by answering anger with anger, insult with insult, injury with injury, death with death (Muir *xxiv*).

Because a man's heated blood was thought to facilitate militant and confrontational attitudes, male physiology seemed to be an important tool that enabled and validated a man's social prerogative to defend honor. In revenge plays, notably *Hamlet*, male revengers often wrestle with their affective dispositions as they attempt to measure up to their punitive obligations. Such obligations may frustrate a man who, like Charlemont, the good Christian protagonist of *The Atheist's Tragedy*, wishes to reject retaliatory anger for religious or ethical reasons.

Hamlet provides a strong example of the way gendered and political motivations inspire one to implement an affect management routine. When discussing Fortinbras in Act IV, Hamlet identifies that he aspires to demonstrate specific levels of royal authority and masculine courage. These qualities are on display through Fortinbras's military maneuvers, which Hamlet describes as a visual signifier of the might and aggression one would expect to see from a powerful prince with a grievance:

> Witness this army of such mass and charge,
>
> Led by a delicate and tender prince,
>
> Whose spirit with divine ambition puff'd

Makes mouths at the invisible event,

Exposing what is mortal and unsure

To all that fortune, death, and danger dare,

Even for an egg-shell. Rightly to be great

Is not to stir without great argument,

But greatly to find quarrel in a straw,

When honor's at the stake (4.4.47-56).

When Hamlet mentions that to "be great" means being able to "find quarrel in a straw" in matters of honor, he refers to a masculine code of conduct which demands that men be quick to participate in contests for hegemony. To be masculine – according to this gendered paradigm, at least – is to be ready and eager to fight another man over "an eggshell." This examination inspires Hamlet to question his own affective state, to ask if his emotional disposition enables him to meet the royal male standard set by Fortinbras. He asks: "How stand I then / That have a father kill'd, a mother stain'd, / Excitements of my reason and my blood, / And let all sleep, while to my shame I see, / The imminent deaths of twenty thousand men" (4.4.56-60). In his own self-assessment, Hamlet contrasts from Fortinbras because not even the most pressing reasons stir him to emote in the aggressive and retaliatory manner expected of males who are born with power and expected to keep it. This seeming inadequacy leads Hamlet to declare that "from this time forth, / My thoughts be bloody, or nothing worth!" (4.4.65-66). In this example, gendered rather than religious paradigms cause Hamlet to implement an affect management objective.

Additionally, the understanding of male physiology as more conducive to sanguine and choleric action also inspires Hamlet to renegotiate his feelings.

Like many other revenge plays, *The Atheist's Tragedy* interrogates the tension between religious morality and individual desires for satisfaction. However, it contrasts with *Hamlet* because its reverent Christian protagonist Charlemont makes the opposite choice. Unlike Hamlet, Charlemont resists the temptation to revenge, ultimately prioritizing his religious values over his cultural prerogative to enact violent masculinity. At the beginning of the play, while Charlemont is away fighting a war, his amoral, atheist uncle D'Amville murders his father and steals his inheritance. In a scene echoing Hamlet's visitation on the battlement, Charlemont encounters father's ghost, who instructs him to return home to regain his estate, but to also remember that revenge is reserved for God. Later, Charlemont has the opportunity to revenge kill D'Amville's son, but the ghost appears to remind Charlemont of his Christian duties. Paraphrasing the edict in Romans 12:19, the ghost tells Charlemont to let "Him revenge my murder and thy wrongs / To whom the justice of revenge belongs" (3.2.32). Charlemont then abstains from violence and allows himself to be captured by his uncle, even though such restraint "torture[s] me between the passion of / My blood and the religion of my soul" (3.2.34-35). Charlemont justifies this choice to subordinate anger by prioritizing his Christian duty to manage affect in a way that facilitates heavenly rewards. He extols the spiritual virtue granted by mastery over physiological anger, explaining that his heart is "above . . . violent maliciousness" because "passions are / My subjects, and I can command them" (3.3.34-46). This choice to subordinate physiological anger reflects religious values aligned with those presented by Wright and Burton. The play's Christian universe rewards Charlemont's piety by granting him a *deus ex machina.* After being sentenced to death and led to D'Amville's chopping block, Charlemont escapes unscathed when D'Amville

fatally falls on the execution weapon. Charlemont maintains that God effects this rescue, declaring that "to Heav'n I attribute the work, / Whose gracious motives made me still forbear / To be mine own revenger. Now I see / That *patience is the honest man's revenge*" (5.2.273-76). Charlemont's affective trajectory throughout the play, in which he uses religious meditation to subordinate humoral inclinations to violent choler and sanguinity, shows performative affect used for the opposite of Hamlet's purpose. Whereas Hamlet eventually discovers a way to accommodate revenge to his religious beliefs, Charlemont refuses this accomodation. Instead, the call to revenge prompts Charlemont to reprioritize Christian ethics over physiological, gendered, and socio-political incitements to revenge.

Just as they do for males like Hamlet and Charlemont, gendered paradigms and humoral theories combine to give shape to early modern expectations for female anger and vengeance. The feminine revenge script differed sharply from the male script due to perceived physiological gender differences. Galenic medicine argued that a woman's heated blood was reserved for generative purposes and then expelled on a monthly basis during menstruation. These theories, which will be treated in more detail in the next chapter, positioned women as less effective sanguine and choleric actors. This perceived weakness helped justify the cultural idea that revenge action was an exclusively male realm. Janet Clare explains that women's roles in revenge action were passive and ancillary, describing how patriarchal structure equated a woman's reputation almost exclusively with chastity. Although females themselves were subordinated, their sexuality could act to mobilize vendettas because it was deemed "property of the male . . . if honor was damaged, this was an insult to male kin and avenged in the name of her father or husband . . . When women . . . are raped, they kill themselves or are killed by next of kin, and this is seen, for the violated female, as the proper course of action" (Clare 115). Women

in revenge narratives may therefore "incite revenge, act as accomplices or be the initial cause of vendetta, but they rarely wield the knife. The combinations of physical weakness and conventional notions of female passivity disempowered the would-be female avenger" (116). This precedent, however, does not mean that women simply did not negotiate the same type of feelings that justified masculine violence. Women were instead encouraged to channel their grief and anger into other avenues, such as cursing the offender and motivating their male allies to action. Many female figures, such as Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus*, adhere to his pattern by serving as a symbol of a not-yet-redressed wrong, a walking inciter of anger and grief that propels their male relatives toward revenge. Fewer female figures, such as Bel-Imperia of *The Spanish Tragedy*, resist this formula by taking active and violent part in a revenge plot.

The gendered cultural scripts for male and female revenge served to circumscribe individuals of both genders in a tightly constrained patriarchal structure. In this structure, gender performances offered one the opportunity to maintain or ascend the hierarchical ladder, although the ladder presents different ceilings for men and women. Men could participate in revenge action to ascend the ladder at another man's expense, but women most often ascended through relationships with male figures, be they fathers, brothers, husbands, or lovers. While revenge might have offered most men and few women opportunities for advancement with the system, it more often serves to "replicate conservative cultural scripts and gender roles . . . Revenge narratives frequently repeat and reinforce such oppressive gender norms, often with women acting as the guardians of a conservative ideal of manliness aligned with violent reprisal. Revenge, from this perspective, is not a liberating form of empowerment, but a repressive cultural script" (Dawson 3).

If the expectations surrounding revenge conform to hegemonic rules of gendered, cultural, and political conduct, then a potential revenger's affective choices represent their relationship to these hegemonic patterns. A would-be avenger's feelings about retaliation indicate conformity with or resistance to the dominant expectations of their gender, class, and familial statuses. A wronged nobleman who, like Hamlet, initiates an affect management routine conducive to revenging action accepts the gendered and socio-political expectations foisted upon him and seeks to conform to them. A wronged nobleman who, like Charlemont, tempers his affective disposition and rejects a vengeful attitude defies these expectations and replaces them with a different set of values. Women had an even more complex set of pressures to navigate when negotiating the call to revenge, given how patriarchy and chastity influenced their social status. But regardless of subject position or individual value set, the incitement to revenge always offers a provocation that shows us how characters choose to feel. Examining these individual choices offers allows us to explore a figure's relationship to dominant cultural ideologies. Additionally, their behaviors provide additional insight into the individual affective management routines of the time, including performative activity, delay, and displacement.

Part 2: Tarquin

Shakespeare's narrative poem *The Rape of Lucrece* offers a case study illustrating how the call to revenge sets in motion affect management choices which reveal insight into character interiority and the ideologies influencing this interiority. The poem exhibits strong influence from Senecan drama, which may also indicate proximity to the theories of affect found in the philosophical texts[13]. Since the poem takes place in a pagan Roman milieu, its principal

characters do not strive to perform the Christian morality so crucial to Wright and Burton. Instead, Tarquin, Lucrece, and Brutus and Collatine all strive to embody an individual vision of conduct shaped by their relationship to the cultural and gendered ideologies of their time. These characters also understand delay and displacement as highly effective methods for governing the body's humoral impulses, as ways to redirect their baseline feelings toward other ones more compatible with their desired affective or ethical states. Empowered by reminders of his royal authority, the Roman prince Tarquin rejects feelings aligned with conventional morality and instead conditions his body toward impulses encouraging his most base and narcissistic desires. He embraces immorality through an understanding of his powerful social position, which might allow him to get away with rape. He uses delay and displacement to reject suggestions from his ethical conscience, thus motivating himself toward a despotic identity that prioritizes accumulating hegemonic power and achieving sensory satisfaction. In this way he resembles the powerful and narcissistic tyrants populating Senecan drama, who consistently invoke their kingly privileges to justify their immoralities.

If Tarquin's perch atop patriarchal hegemony makes him bolder and allows him to indulge in depraved urges, then Lucrece's position towards the bottom of patriarchal structure restricts the acceptable ways in which she can manage her affective impulses. Because Lucrece lives in a cultural context that subjugates women and stamps their bodies as male property, she must operate according to a gendered code of ethics[14]. This code renders Lucrece less willing or able to fully act out a suite of feelings more tightly associated with masculinity, including ire, wrath, and indignation. Instead, Lucrece uses delay and displacement to encourage feelings and behaviors that remain more or less circumscribed within an acceptable range of feminine emotions. Despite the limitations placed on her, Lucrece makes good use of delay to ensure that

her trauma and grief serve a constructive purpose. Like a Senecan sage, she resists an initial inclination toward fracturing lament and instead uses her wits to devise a sacrificial performance that will inspire Brutus and Collatine to take revenge on her behalf. Brutus and Collatine illustrate displacement because Lucrece's death first inflicts upon them a debilitating sorrow, but they then employ theatrical rhetoric and gesture to replace sorrow with righteous anger. Their act of displacement introduces the types of masculine feelings and behavior denied to Lucrece – boldness and audacity – and suffuses them with her moral valence. Brutus and Collatine thus paint the poem's clearest picture of displacement, illustrating how the mind can reorganize the body's affective current through behaviors which modify humoral dynamics or infuse them with moral energy.

My interpretation of Tarquin complicates the accepted reading that he rapes Lucrece simply because accumulating choleric lust compels him physiologically. Catherine Belling succinctly encapsulates this reading, explaining that "Shakespeare presents Tarquin's sexual desire for Lucrece as an uprising of excessive and overheated blood against the restraints of reason and morality" (Belling 115). Tarquin indeed experiences a fluid imbalance that causes "overexcitement of the body, an arousal of humors that could hinder mental faculties temporarily and make the will inoperative" (Antonucci 151). However, narrow focus on Tarquin's humoral mechanics obfuscates the agency he retains as a moral actor. I wish to draw attention to how Tarquin aspires to a particular – albeit depraved – identity through acts of meditation, rhetoric, and behavior designed to engender a physiological state congruent with his debauched, self-serving desires. Tarquin deliberately conditions his humor to produce a lusty and violent disposition by using delay and displacement for immoral purposes, using them to reject unwanted influence from his good judgment and instead replace it with flawed and malicious

reasoning that authorizes his gross desires. Tarquin's perverse reasoning seems inspired by the logic of his literary predecessors, the Senecan tyrants who justify their misdeeds through sheer hegemonic force. Warped by unchecked power, these figures exhibit "minds rendered arrogant by prosperity, they hate those whom they have injured" (23). They denigrate values such as "decency, respect for the law, sanctity, piety, fidelity," calling these traits "the common man's virtues" and instead maintaining that "kings may do as they please" (*Thyestes* 208). Tarquin falls back on this logic in a key moment of pause where he debates internally with his conscience, an important schism which shows that he possesses the capacity to act morally despite his humoral state. But by choosing to embrace the tyrant's logic and implementing a meditative regimen that catapults his lusty choler to the forefront, Tarquin demonstrates that he is not merely a physiological body. He instead retains some moral agency, demonstrated by deliberate means he uses to synergize his lascivious intent and physiological state.

The poem's exposition suggests that a mix of conscious desires and unconscious physiological influences construct Tarquin's affective state and motivate his behavior. He begins the poem as a lustful body governed by choler; he remains this way partly because of pernicious logic and willful behaviors that maintain and intensify this humoral disposition. We first meet "lust-breathed Tarquin" as he "leaves the Roman host" (*Lucrece* 3), speeding towards an unsolicited and socially-taboo meeting with "Collatine's fair love, Lucrece the chaste" (7). The narrator attributes Tarquin's quick departure to inflamed humors sparked by Collatine's blazon of Lucrece's beauty and chastity. He claims Tarquin departs "with swift intent . . . to quench the coal in which his liver goes" (46-47). These lines suggest that Tarquin experiences physiological tumult caused by an imbalanced liver, which is "the blood forming organ, the . . . source of anger and sexual desire that made the body swell and overheat" (Antonucci 151). Yet the narrator also

suggests that an act of reasoning, predicated on Tarquin's aggrandized self-conception, also helps construct the prince's affective and ethical states. After Collatine proclaims that "no king possesses such a peerless dame" as his wife Lucrece *(Lucrece* 20-21), the narrator notes that Tarquin dwells on "high-pitched thoughts, that meaner men should vaunt / The golden lap which their superiors want" (41-42). These lines show Tarquin becoming animated not through humoral desire alone, but also through his ideas of masculine hegemony. He takes offense because the "meaner" Collatine tantalizes him with a desirable object that remains inaccessible despite imperial privilege. Such narcissism, undoubtedly exacerbated by his hegemonic power and bloated self-worth, provides Tarquin a reason – albeit a bad one – to stroke the choler that generates his lust. For Tarquin, violating Lucrece not only satiates the demands of his material body, but also offers psychological satisfaction that repairs his wounded pride.

Tarquin returns to this interior reasoning at important scene in the poem, a moment where his humoral desires cool after a spontaneous bit of careful judgment reminds him that raping Lucrece will have severe consequences. After Tarquin meets Lucrece, receives her hospitality, and retires to his guest chambers, he lays awake and spends approximately seventy-five lines pondering moral, civic, and even self-serving arguments against rape[15]. The narrator relays that Tarquin considers these arguments while softly striking "his falchion on a flint . . . from the cold stone sparks of fire do fly" (176-77). This image foreshadows the affect management move that comes next, in which Tarquin reignites "the cold stone" of his humoral body back to fiery arousal. Instead of embracing the reasons why he shouldn't rape Lucrece, Tarquin rejects their influence by forcing himself to remember the pleasurable sensation of holding Lucrece's hand. He recalls "how her hand, in my hand being locked, / Forced it to tremble with her loyal fear!" (260-61). Dwelling on the subordinate nature of Lucrece's "loyal fear" titillates Tarquin, reminds

him that kings can take what they please, and compels him to reject an ethical posture: "What hunt I then for color or excuses? / All orators are dumb when beauty pleadeth, / Poor wretches have remorse in poor abuses" (267-69).[16] Tarquin here declares that he is not a "poor wretch" who commits a misdeed and must exhibit remorse by compulsion; he is instead a sovereign king who needs no "color or excuses" to enjoy Lucrece's beauty. Invigorated by this reminder of his political power, Tarquin dismisses his moment of good judgment: "Childish fear, avaunt, debating die! / Respect and reason wait on wrinkled age . . . Who fears sinking where such treasure lies?" (274-80). By employing mental images of pleasure and domination to banish the "heedful fear" that briefly extinguished his humoral desires (281), Tarquin uses displacement to match his body's affective state to his nefarious lack of ethics.

After deciding to rape Lucrece, Tarquin references his brain, heart, and eye to suggest that wicked but deliberate reason tightly controls his affective state and resultant behavior. His language reverses the way many humoral discourses used sensory organs to highlight the body's porous and inconstant nature. In general, humoral commentators associated the heart and brain with good judgment, and the eye with usurping or chaotic urges. As an example, early modern love poems feature dazzling lights or bewitching scents that enter the body through the eyes or nose to cause a destabilizing reaction that alters humor and thwarts reason. These reactions were thought to disturb the brain and prevent it from properly directing the repository and distributor of humors: the heart. Burton describes the adverse effects of a brain compromised by sensation, explaining that a "disordered imagination, which misinforming the heart, causeth all these distemperatures, alteration, and confusion of the spirits and humors" (Burton 1.2.252). He acknowledges that ocular stimuli threatens the brain's good judgment and may cause humoral instability, specifically claiming that the eye often "betrays the soul" (3.2.76). Burton draws from

classical literature to show the eye's treachery, including a lover's complaint "in Apuleius . . . 'Thou art the cause of my grief; thy eyes, piercing through mine eyes to my inner parts, have set my bowels on fire, and therefore pity me that I am now ready to die for thy sake'" (3.2.86). This lover's speech illustrates the eye's penchant for destabilization, as a rapturous picture of beauty enters the lover's sight, transmits a sensation to the brain, and then prevents the brain from adequately disbursing correct instructions to the heart. The resulting humoral chaos afflicts the lover's "inner parts," including his bowels. The eye thus causes an unsettling psychosomatic chaos that afflicts the speaker's higher and lower functions. The passage also reinforces the broader pattern of humoral symbolism alluded to throughout Burton's work and early modern culture at large: the brain and heart are associated with good humoral governance, while the eye symbolizes destabilizing sensual impulses.

Understanding the symbolism attached to the eye, heart, and brain helps make sense of Tarquin's declaration that "my heart will never countermand mine eye" (*Lucrece* 276). In these lines, Tarquin deliberately inverts the humoral body's normal hierarchy of organs, willingly elevating the eye's demands over the heart's mandate to properly manage humor. He ultimately chooses to condone and strengthen his body's intensifying choleric charge. The narrator illustrates this prioritization of humoral urges by placing Tarquin's eye in a position of grammatical agency throughout the passage. First, the narrator notes that Tarquin "wickedly . . . stalks" into Lucrece's room and "gazeth on her yet unstained bed . . . Rolling his greedy eyeballs in his head. / By their high treason is his heart mislead" (365-69). The narrator then reveals how the eye dominates the heart to redouble Tarquin's desires, explaining that the prince's eye into "a greater uproar tempts his veins / And they like straggling slaves for pillage fighting . . . Swell in their pride" (427-32). These lines, partly because of the way they give the eye grammatical

agency, seem to depict Tarquin as a humoral body acting out of physiological compulsion. But the narrator also alludes to the bad reasoning and willful choices which support and intensify Tarquin's humor. When relating how Tarquin's eye directs his hand toward Lucrece's breast, the narrator describes the hand as "proud of . . . dignity" and "smoking with pride" (437-38). Referencing pride incarnate reminds us that Tarquin's hand embodies his ethos as a tyrant. This tyrannical ethos includes Tarquin's unchecked sense of imperial privilege, his narcissism, and his moral bankruptcy. These elements undergird the malevolent reasoning that Tarquin uses to maintain his physiological lust, particularly when he rekindles his cooled desire by meditating on power and pleasure just before entering Lucrece's chamber. Tarquin broadly illustrates how the mind might work toward a desired affective outcome by leveraging the humoral body's connection to other elements in an affective ecology: internal reasoning, performative behavior, and the most oft-discussed element of this ecology, external or environmental influences. Given that his hand embodies his pride and villainy, Tarquin also illustrates how mental energy imbues bodies and actions with ethical significance.

Part 2: Lucrece and the Feminine Script

Like Tarquin, who uses displacement to maintain choleric humor and desire, Lucrece also demonstrates agentic participation in the humoral system through use of Senecan affect management strategies. After the rape, Lucrece experiences a plethora of fracturing feelings, including terror and trauma. But instead of allowing these feelings to dominate her mental space, she uses Senecan delay to withstand their impact, engage her rational faculty, and formulate an adequate solution. Delay helps Lucrece concoct a spectacle that relies on affective transmission

to subsume her desire for a personal revenge into a politically-motivated, collective act of social reform. And because she designs this plan to be executed by male proxies, she adheres to her patriarchal society's religious and political codes. These codes cause Lucrece to understand her "body" and "soul" as property "kept for heaven and Collatine" (1163-65). She is therefore unable or unwilling to transgress a male hegemony of power through direct interference in political or judicial matters. Lucrece's ruined chastity further complicates the ways in which she might respond to Tarquin's actions. Patriarchal standards of sexual purity and wifely loyalty prevent the defiled Lucrece from properly fulfilling her conjugal duties, which she admits by acknowledging that Collatine should not "know / The stained taste of violated troth" (1058-59). But if she kills herself to release Collatine from their marital bond, then she robs him of her body and commits unsanctioned theft of his property. Through Senecan delay and displacement, Lucrece manages her affect and attains vengeance without violating these patriarchal demands. Her competency in managing affect while maintaining femininity resists humoral theory's misogynistic understanding of women, given that humoral models stipulated that women were more prone to lapses in reasoning and affective governance because their bodies were colder and less vital.[17] My analysis ultimately reads Lucrece as a competent and agentic governor of affect, but it concurrently acknowledges that internalized patriarchy circumscribes the logic which guides her actions.

Lucrece implements delay shortly after the rape, when she recognizes that giving physical expression to her grief offers no real benefits. She declares: "In vain I rail at Opportunity, / At Time, at Tarquin, and uncheerful Night . . . This helpless smoke of words doth me no right" (*Lucrece* 1023-27). Instead of exhibiting the sorrow expected of a stereotypically weak woman, Lucrece withstands the force of her trauma to formulate a plan that reflects

Seneca's nuanced definition of revenge. In *De Ira*, Seneca describes how revenge requires mental acuity. He calls it a "complex" action performed though a progression of steps that synthesize reason and anger: the subject "understand[s] something to have happened . . . becomes indignant . . . condemns the deed . . . avenges it" (*De Ira* 45-46). Lucrece demonstrates this process as she changes from delay to displacement, rejecting grief in order to build righteous anger. She generates this anger through over two-hundred lines of rhetorical performance, in which she rails at unjust Fortune, enumerates Tarquin's crimes before the universe, and even wishes for "some mischance" to "cross Tarquin in his flight . . . make him curse this cursed crimeful night. / Let ghastly shadows his lewd eyes affright" (*Lucrece* 968-71). This displacement shifts Lucrece's affective charge away from her initial grief and towards feelings conducive to planning revenge. Using imagery borrowed from the theatre, Lucrece then emphasizes how she aspires to "let forth my foul defiled blood" in a suicide spectacle designed to motivate Collatine to punish Tarquin (1029). She seems to understand how spectacle and sensation can transmit an affective charge into the vulnerable eye, suffuse the body, and influence the brain and heart to alter humor, particularly when she emphasizes sight in declaring that "Collatine, shalt oversee this will; / How was I overseen that thou shalt see it!" (1205-06). She prepares to stage her death as one would stage a popular play, using "paper, ink, and pen" to craft a summons that assembles her audience (1289). This invitation gives Lucrece an opportunity to perform "the act in the presence of other soldiers, besides the husband she has summoned for that purpose" (Belsey 328). Lucrece's careful planning helps illustrate Seneca's understanding of revenge as a collaboration between reason and indignation, a synthesis where the avenger must process injustice and then use reason to determine a course of redress. This reasoning reflects her internalization of patriarchy and her awareness of humoral ecology, as she

plans to transmit her bodily ire to her husband and his lieutenants because they are socially positioned to complete her revenge.

Lucrece's revenge preparation also incorporates an ethical element, given that she charges her affect with virtue through socio-religious arguments justifying revenge against a tyrant. While planning ways to stage her death, Lucrece meditates on arguments discussing how justice and society might benefit from Tarquin's ouster. Her argument reflects a sixteenth-century Protestant conviction that revenge could be socially and spiritually purifying if performed under the right conditions, including instances where empowered, scrupulous individuals justifiably revolt against an evil ruler[18]. Lucrece infuses her indignation with virtue by invoking this logic, explaining that it is "Time's glory . . . to calm contending kings / To unmask falsehood, and bring truth to light . . . To wrong the wronger till he render right" (939-42). These lines see Lucrece strike a careful balance between desire to accommodate her society's patriarchal gender roles and desire for revenge. She declares that the nebulous personification "Time" will bring about Tarquin's downfall, rather than any vengeful human agent. This phrasing helps Lucrece perform subordinate femininity – or at least the appearance of subordinate femininity – by obfuscating her level of agency in the revenge. But in her next lines, Lucrece relies on notions of humoral ecology and affective transmission to clarify that she indeed possesses a powerful capacity to take revenge: "My tongue shall utter all, mine eyes like sluices, / As from a mountain spring that feeds a dale, / Shall gush pure streams to purge my impure tale" (1076-78). Here, Lucrece disguises her personal desire for revenge by distributing her agency to her dismembered and depersonalized sensory apparatuses: her tongue "utter[s] all" and her eyes "gush pure streams." Through this flurry of bodily activity, Lucrece will infect Collatine and his men with feelings sourced from her affective "spring" of zealous, yet

sanctified, anger. Once reconstituted in the men's bodies, her anger will compel them to "chase injustice with revengeful arms: / Knights, by their oaths, should right poor ladies' harms" (1693-94). Lucrece here deploys an anti-tyrannical ethical vocabulary to suggest that she transmits ennobled intent to her husband and his men, as her performance and death will sanctify violence against Tarquin with personal and civic virtue. Collatine and his crew will not only achieve redress for the violated Lucrece, but for a society besmirched by Tarquin's evil.

Part 4: Brutus, Collatine, and the Male Script

Lucrece's example helps demonstrate how active mental participation in humoral ecology could counterbalance the body's vulnerability to other sources of affect. She illustrates how an intelligent subject – one aware of methods for generating and mobilizing affect – could summon affect, project it outward, stimulate other humoral bodies, and ultimately encourage those bodies to feel or act in a desired way. As the observers of Lucrece's performance and recipients of her affective charges, Brutus, Collatine, and Lucrece's father Lucretius complete this illustration of Senecan-inspired affect management rules. They present a clearer picture of the subject's vulnerable position in humoral ecology because they appear together. Unlike Tarquin and Lucrece, who appear alone and thus manage their affective states without interference from other humoral bodies, these characters are proximate to each other and therefore susceptible to each other's humoral and affective states. Brutus negotiates this proximity through his response to Lucrece's death, which afflicts Collatine and Lucretius with crippling sorrow. Specifically, he re-infects their melancholic bodies with Lucrece's righteous anger by prompting them to perform a behavioral regimen designed to supplant grief with ire. This regimen reflects an early modern

understanding of anger and sorrow as natural opposites, each of which could be used to temper the other. Seneca himself provides a foundation for this idea, explaining that those inclined to "moisture, or dryness and stiffness" are not prone to anger but "cowardice, moroseness, despair, and suspiciousness" (*De Ira* 20). Burton makes clear that this view persisted into the early modern period. He notes that a melancholic physiology could be counterbalanced through activities that "boil the blood about the heart" and engender a "warm temper of mind," although this warmth can "make men prone to anger, for fire is full of movement and vigor" (Burton 2.19.70). However, a disciplined individual might safely balance sanguine heat and melancholy coolness by switching between "opposite modes of treatment, let us always attack that one of them which is gaining mastery" (2.20.72). Brutus demonstrates these rules for displacement by smartly leveraging anger against sorrow in order to control the affective environment.

Brutus models displacement after Collatine begins to emote frantic, unchecked sorrow. According to the narrator, Collatine suffers a "deep vexation of his inward soul" that stirs the humors and manifests through countenance and gesture (*Lucrece* 1779). First, Collatine experiences "a dumb arrest upon his tongue" (1780) that makes him babble unintelligibly except for anguished repetition of the name "Tarquin" (1786). This verbal tic quickly mutates into more intense, highly visible indicators of sorrow. Collatine and Lucretius "weep with strife" and produce a "windy tempest" where "rains, and busy winds give o'er" (1788-91). Collatine and Lucretius seem wholly debilitated by grief, reflecting period explanations that proximity to others can multiply affective charges across bodies. Wright maintains that a friend's influence can help one manage humor and feeling, explaining that "it is good . . . to have a wise and discreet friend to admonish us of our Passions when we err from the path and plain way of Virtue . . . another may judge our actions better than ourselves" (Wright 148). Burton offers a more

specific assessment of melancholic sorrow, explaining that it can be "instantly removed" by a friend's "wisdom, persuasion, advice, his good means, which we could not otherwise apply unto ourselves. A friend's counsel is a charm, like mandrake wine" (Burton 2.2.107). These ideas about commiseration explain how Brutus's shift toward the sanguine passions change incites a corresponding change in his friends. Because humoral bodies are vulnerable to affective influences from the outside, Brutus can leverage his own feelings to manipulate those of his companions. By presenting them with a new mood to emulate, Brutus can effectively alter the environment's emotional valence.

Before he can displace the sorrow afflicting Collatine and Lucretius, Brutus must first work to master his own feelings. Since affective transmissions are most effective if one "first be afflicted with the same passion," Brutus initially changes his own affect from anguish to ardor (Wright 211). The poem does not explore Brutus's interiority with the same depth afforded to the other characters, but nonetheless his actions present a clear picture of how early moderns sought to replace unwanted passions by "doing something or other that shall be opposite unto them, thinking of something else, persuading by reason, or however, to make a sudden alteration of them" (Burton 2.2.204). The narrator reveals that Brutus responds to sorrow with a judicious resolve, rejecting incitement to mourn in the same way that the sound Senecan sage rejects a pre-passion. Brutus maintains enough mental acuity to pluck "the knife from Lucrece's side" (*Lucrece* 1807). He then looks at Collatine and Lucretius and becomes disconcerted at the "emulation in their woe" (1808). To prevent these two from creating a feedback loop that intensifies melancholy, Brutus works to maintain an affective state that counteracts their excessive grief. The narrator states Brutus begins "to clothe his wit in state and pride, / Burying in Lucrece' wound his folly's show" (1809-10). The active verbs in these lines – "clothe" and

"burying" – suggest that Brutus deliberately performs like a competent, rational actor unbowed by tragedy. Despite his reputation as a glib jokester who delights in "sportive words . . . utt'ring foolish things," Brutus discards the "shallow habit" of his normally cheery disposition and summons "long-hid wits . . . To check the tears in Collatinus' eyes" (1813-17). This language suggests that Brutus resists two factors that could incite inappropriate feelings: his natural joviality and his peers' despair. By elevating his capacity for cogent thought over interior and exterior affective influences, Brutus operates in a Senecan mode where mental deliberation tightly governs what might otherwise be unruly feeling.

After adopting a hardened posture that displaces any room for sorrow, Brutus extends his affective demeanor toward Collatine. He prepares Collatine for an affective shift by first introducing logic against doleful lamentation[19]. He calls Collatine's weeping "unmanly," commanding him to think of a course of action more becoming of a "Courageous Roman" (1828). Such a pointed appeal incorporates strategies which, according to Wright, engender hatred and ire. Wright's discussion of ire lists several performative elements that Brutus might use to stop Collatine's weeping, including a "pronunciation sharp, often falling with pathetical repetitions, iterated interrogations proving, confirming, and urging reason" (Wright 216). Brutus specifically employs "iterated interrogations . . . urging reason" when he asks Collatine:

> Why, Collatine, is woe the cure for woe?
>
> Do wounds help wounds, or grief help grievous deeds?
>
> Is it revenge to give thyself a blow
>
> For his foul act by whom thy fair wife bleeds?

Such childish humor from weak minds proceeds;

Thy wretched wife mistook the matter so,

To slay herself, that should have slain her foe (*Lucrece* 1821-27).

This passage sees Brutus employ a cultural paradigm that associated weeping with weakness, as early modern "medical literature . . . unambiguously describes women, children, the elderly, and the weak, as being, by their physical nature, prone to weeping" (Lange 3). Brutus puts Collatine in this powerless group, accusing him of exhibiting a "childish humor" engendered of a "weak mind." Such language challenges Collatine to discard his enfeebling sorrow and collect himself. By doing so, Collatine can distinguish himself from his "wretched wife," who acted according to a feminine script directing her to respond to Tarquin's violence inwardly rather than outwardly. If "tears divide the weeper from the community, isolating him or her (more usually her) in an unhealthy way," then Brutus's provocation invites Collatine to rejoin a communion of politically significant Roman men capable of responding to Tarquin's villainy with force rather than impotent weeping (3). By using masculine gender ideals to interrupt Collatine's disconsolate reverie, Brutus prepares his friend to expel the crushing misery caused by Lucrece's death and transition to more deliberate control of thought and action.

After disrupting Collatine's melancholic outburst, Brutus finishes the displacement process by performing an angry retribution ritual that motivates vengeance against Tarquin. Brutus needs to bring Collatine to a lucid state that enables preparation and planning, given that one "cannot . . . deal with revenge and punishment without the mind being cognizant of them (*De Ira* 2.3). He achieves this end by enacting a retaliatory yet purposeful performance of ire that displaces Collatine's sorrow as "one nail drive[s] out the other" (Wright 151). According to

Wright, a speaker can produce ire in a listener by asking them to focus on various details of the wrong endured, such as the qualities of the injurer, the circumstance and methods involved in the attack, and the pains of the injured party. He contends that through "exaggeration of the injury received," one's wishes for "revenge may be revived, quickened, and increased" (Wright 287). Brutus prefigures this understanding through his address emphasizing Tarquin's villainy. He urges the need to address Tarquin's crime, focusing specifically on how injuries are greater when "proceed[ing] from a public Magistrate or officer of justice whom it concerneth in equity to procure that every man have right" (287). Brutus tells Collatine:

> Courageous Roman, do not steep thy heart
>
> In such relenting dew of lamentations,
>
> But kneel with me and help to bear thy part,
>
> To rouse our Roman gods with invocations,
>
> That they will suffer these abominations
>
> (Since Rome herself in them doth stand disgraced)
>
> By our strong arms from forth her fair streets chased (*Lucrece* 1828-34).

First, Brutus directs Collatine to abandon the impotent "dew of lamentations," and instead actively "do thy part" in obtaining revenge for "the death of this true wife" (1841). He specifically dwells on Tarquin's "abominations," calling out Lucrece's "chaste blood so unjustly stained" by Tarquin's "wrongs" (1836-40). By highlighting Tarquin's unpunished evil, Brutus hopes to shift Collatine's humoral disposition from a melancholic listlessness to the energy and determination associated with sanguine types. Brutus lionizes these sanguine passions by

claiming they benefit the entire state, as they can propel Collatine and other outraged Romans to improve their government by deposing the tyrant Tarquin. Additionally, Brutus's invocation to the Roman pantheon seems to reflect the Protestant notion that in order to combat tyranny, "God may raise up 'open avengers from among his servants'" (Woodbridge 142). Invoking moral and political righteousness implied through allegiance with "our Roman gods" allows Brutus to further impress a sanguine set of affects – ire, vengeance, and audacity – upon the recently-weeping Collatine. In this way, Brutus completes an affective displacement that begins within the individual, spreads outward into other bodies, and then finds expression through group action.

Collatine does not speak in response to Brutus's address, but the text depicts an act of imitation suggesting that he emulates Brutus's affective shift from corybantic sorrow to solemn, measured revenge. In addition to speech, performative acts helped the individual generate new affect that could supplant undesired affect. Wright contends that "passions are moved by action" (211), defining "action" as any "natural or artificial moderation, qualification, modification, or composition of the voice, countenance, and gesture of the body, proceeding from some passion and apt to stir up the like" (214). This understanding of activity's influence over the passions illustrates period ideas about actors, who were thought to generate genuine affect through performance, as occurs when Hamlet jealously criticizes the First Player's ability to "force his soul so to his own conceit" for a fiction. (*Hamlet* 2.2.553). Wright explains that as good actors work, they "stir up that affect in himself he intendeth to imprint in the hearts of his hearers" (Wright 214). As if taking a cue from the theatre, Brutus invents a bit of stage business that forces Collatine and the other Romans to act out righteous anger and vengeance rather than

sorrow. At the poem's conclusion, he asks his companions to swear a revenge oath punctuated by verbal repetition and physical gestures:

> [Brutus] strook his hand upon his breast,
>
> And kissed the fatal knife to end his vow;
>
> And to his protestation urg'd the rest,
>
> Who, wond'ring at him, did his words allow.
>
> Then jointly to the ground their knees they bow,
>
> And that deep vow which Brutus made before,
>
> He doth again repeat, and that they swore (1842-48).

Collatine and his allies change their emotional tenor by verbally and physically reenacting Brutus's grave revenge oath. The men communicate their assent to Brutus's proposed affective shift through physical activity, jointly bowing "to the ground their knees" and repeating "that deep vow which Brutus made before." Since Collatine and the others use "modification of the . . . countenance and gesture of the body" in order to generate one passion that replaces another, they illustrate how one might consciously manipulate affect through performative behaviors (Wright 214). And because these behaviors project the mind's hallowed understanding of the revenge mission into bodily humor and outward physical expressions, this ritual also illustrates how early moderns incorporated ethics into performative affect management.

The Rape of Lucrece, then, is ultimately a poem which reconciles humoral theory with socio-cultural and religious ethics. It demonstrates, through case studies featuring its principal

characters, how humoral physiology leaves significant room for conscious mental and behavioral participation in the ecology of affect. This participation enables the subject to work to reject unwanted feelings, perhaps those of the choleric or melancholy variety, despite the tangibly real, material humors which incite these feelings in the body. Through this work, which consists of Senecan-inspired meditations and performances that manipulate feelings through meditation, rhetoric, or behavior, the subject can also imbue their feelings with an ethical charge that would otherwise be absent in an exclusively humoral model of affect. This transformative power of the mind balances the disadvantages of the malleable humoral body, which are its natural fluctuations and its vulnerability to external sources of affect. A deliberate mind can think past these influences and find ways to leverage body's malleability so that it may reach a particular affective state, which may then be imposed on the outside environment. *The Rape of Lucrece* illustrates these concepts to clearly highlight the early modern subject's capacity for radical self-determination, even in spite of a system perceived to destabilize identity through material and external influences. However, the poem's presentation of Lucrece also illustrates the problem which will be fully explored in the next chapter. Although performative affect management outlines the mental and physical tools that subjects could use to control their affective dispositions, women like Lucrece were often oppressed by gendered and ideological constraints. These constraints worked to limit or vilify the available, socially-acceptable affective responses that could be wielded by revenging women. In the chapter that follows, I will explain the medical and cultural factors that ensconced these constraints, their effects on female revengers, and examine whether women could resist gendered pressures that tried to exclude them from the full suite of performative affect management tools.

Chapter 3: Both a Revenger and a Gentlewoman

I: Introduction

Early modern depictions of female revengers reflect epistemological prejudices based on humoral theories and cultural depictions. These stereotypes positioned women as intellectually weaker, less competent governors of affect than their male counterparts, and therefore less capable than achieving an effective revenge. While humoral theories formed the most obvious basis for this sexist stigma, they operated upon a classical foundation that represented angry or vengeful women as unnatural and monstrous. Dramatists from antiquity, including Seneca, had long associated femininity with histrionic rage through their depictions of the goddesses of vendettas, the Furies. These figures personified the impulse to revenge, and would often appear to stir up the hatred and grief necessary to incite a revenger to action. Since the feminine-gendered Furies encouraged individuals to act out on morally destructive emotional impulses, they were sometimes presented as the antithesis of moral governance. This depiction of the Furies exerts a shadow presence in humoral theory, as it undergirds the humoral representation of women's affect as chaotic and potentially self-harming. The pages that follow survey three female revenge protagonists to investigate how they replicate or resist the images of the Furies and the humoral stereotypes these images inspired. Of the three characters examined, Martha from Henry Chettle's *Hoffman or a Revenge for a Father* does the most to reject classical and

humoral notions of feminine weakness. Because Martha uses displacement to limit her grief and maintain her wits to plan an effective revenge, she suggests that Senecan affect management strategies were powerful enough to elevate women above perceived barriers between genders.

Tamora, from Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, exemplifies the way that depictions of the Furies negatively influenced the representation of female affect in the early modern period. The play conflates Tamora's mercilessly vengeful attitudes with those of the bloodthirsty Furies, who were understood to typify feminine jealousy and spite. By associating Tamora with these attitudes, the play trades in a period stigma that female judgments were often corrupted by cruelty and vindictiveness. Furthermore, Tamora appears as humorally unhinged creature who willfully courts destabilizing affective states, including grief, rage, and vengeance. Because it broadly adheres to cultural stereotype and humoral consensus, *Titus Andronicus* fails to fully highlight how women might be able to resist their physiological dynamics, change their affective state, and achieve a desired outcome. Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* presents a more hospitable view of feminine affect and agency, as it positions Bel-Imperia as a capable governor of affect and a more effective driver of the revenge plot. Though Bel-Imperia wields grace and cunning, she fails to fully reject the range of affects personified by the Furies. Her death during *Soliman and Perseda* forecloses the possibility that she might overcome the physiological dynamics intensifying her revenging disposition and thereby resist narratives of feminine vindictiveness. Additionally, Bel-Imperia's death in the context of the play-within-a-play denies her revenger's gratifying prerogative to reveal themselves as the author of their surprised victim's suffering. She instead leaves this responsibility to Hieronimo, which continues a patriarchal pattern where male figures pontificate on the meaning of a less powerful woman's circumstances or behavior. Bel-Imperia does demonstrate agency by deviating from Hieronimo's script and writing her own

death to escape patriarchal constraints, but the ambivalence of her situation means a more illustrative model of affective governance appears elsewhere.

Unlike these two aforementioned plays, Henry Chettle's *The Tragedy of Hoffman or a Revenge for a Father* features a woman who successfully tempers the destabilizing hunger for revenge. Martha, mother of the slain Prince Otho, mollifies humoral impulses to anger and rejects the injurious attitudes modeled by the Furies. She admirably succeeds in subduing excess grief and anger by employing delay and displacement. Martha specifically uses displacement to harden her heart against grief and instead maintain her wits as she seeks to eliminate her son's killer Hoffman. Her example suggests that despite the humoral system's prejudicial understanding of feminine weakness, early modern women could rise above the perceived weaknesses of their sex to practice disciplined humoral governance and reach affective agency. While the art of revenge tragedy generally purveys a patriarchal humoral epistemology, *Hoffman* implies that women could actively determine their humoral states despite the assumed disadvantages of their colder bodies. This play represents a huge challenge to the determinism embedded in humoral theory, since Martha's use of performative affect management undermines the system's fixedness. *Hoffman* further undermines humoral determinism through its titular character Hoffman, who demonstrates an affective inconsistency more associated with women. The dynamic between these two characters threatens to upend the way humoral theory protected patriarchal structure, since men who behave like Hoffman and women who behave like Martha might call into question the veracity of humoral stereotypes that supposed a weaker feminine body.

II: Cultural Representations of Feminine Anger: The Furies

Through they carried significant weight in the early modern period, humoral theories did not contribute exclusively to the idea of female inconstancy. Negative stereotypes about a woman's ability to manage her feelings had infiltrated early modern culture through the classical dramas which supported fifteenth-century pedagogical structures and artistic tropes. Because these texts represented women as inconstant governors of affect, they both inspired and reinforced humoral theories about feminine coldness. Drama from antiquity disseminated this idea most explicitly through its representation of the Furies, also called the Erinyes. In *Revenge Tragedies of the Renaissance*, Janet Clare defines the Furies as the "goddesses of vendettas" in classical mythology and explains that:

> An appeal to them was the instigation of revenge. The Furies were also seen as personalized curses, since the curse was interpreted not as words alone, but as a potent force in stirring up mysterious powers to action . . . The concept of 'turning Fury,' said of a woman by a man, denigrates the female by signifying frenzied, uncontrolled emotion, but it also underlies male anxiety at the power the female curse might unleash. The curse represents a descriptive, imaginative death and as such was appropriated as a female weapon (116).

Clare's definition reflects the close association between the Furies and the feminine, but in their original appearances in mythology, the Furies were less feminine and more "'transgender.' They are predominantly female in outward appearance, although incapable of biological reproduction, but capable of acting as surrogates, representatives and even vicarious embodiments of the interests of wronged men" (Hall 41). These figures became tightly linked to vengeful femininity

through “Greek tragedy’s representations of the Erinyes as snaky haired women” who exhibit “chthonic, thantatological, and maternal associations” (Findlay 63). The Greeks depicted the Erinyes as symbols of a “particular barren, aggressive, orally-fixated version of femininity” (Hall 50), thus guaranteeing that “it would be impossible to dislocate our thinking about revenge from our negative cultural constructions of the female psyche” (34). These unflattering representations of the Furies – and by extension, of femininity – were passed down to the early modern milieu through sources inspired by Greek drama’s understanding of the Furies

Senecan drama, including the plays *Medea* and *Hercules Furens*, helped transmit Greek depictions of Furies and their corresponding influence on gender conceptions into early modern cultural consciousness. RJ Tarrant explains that Roman poets and playwrights often demonstrated their awareness of their Greek predecessors through a “form of competitive *imitatio* and *aemulatio*. Allusions to an eminent Greek forerunner can serve to demonstrate a Roman writer’s *doctrina* and his place in a tradition of learned literary composition; they can also make an implicit claim for equal status with an established Greek model” (217). Seneca’s adaptation of Euripides’s *Medea* serves these multiple functions; it was chosen as an homage to and engagement with the Greek canon, but also because “Euripidean material . . . gave greatest scope for Seneca’s primary dramatic interest, exploring the pathology of the emotions” (220). Seneca’s *Medea* exhibits the Greek gendering of the Furies through its titular female character, a violent, spiteful, cursing avatar of vengeance who appears couched in the imagery of femininity and motherhood. His version of the character elicits some sympathy because of the injustice done to her, but such sympathy erodes as she displays behavior which prefigures the humoral conceptions of feminine inconstancy and anger. Throughout the play, Medea actively works to intensify the extremes of feeling to which she already seems predisposed. The course of the play

sees her convey a variety of histrionic emotions, including vestiges of love for her divorcing husband Jason and their children. However, these other feelings are subsumed by an inversely proportionate anger that becomes Medea's most animating feature. Not only does this frenzied anger recall the wild vitriol of the Greek Furies, but it also helps set a precedent that reinforces the humoral theories which depicted women as jealous and quick to anger. The play anticipates a humoral trope that presents impassioned individuals through the imagery of unpredictable and tempestuous weather, ultimately associating femininity with a dangerous affective temperament that mixed extremity, volatility, and impetuousness to produce an especially chaotic mode of anger.

Seneca links his Medea character directly to the Furies through an introductory soliloquy suffused with rage, snakes, and vindictive cursing. The play's first lines see the aggrieved and frantic Medea immediately invoke the "vengeful Furies, punishers of sinners, / wild in your hair with serpents running free" (1.13-14). She seeks their aid because she's been torn from her husband Jason, whom the king Creon commanded to divorce Medea and marry his daughter Creusa instead. Medea asks the Furies to kill Jason's "new wife, / kill her father, and all the royal family. / What is worse than death? What can I ask for Jason? / That he may live – in poverty and fear . . . hated and homeless . . . Let him want me as a wife" (1.13-23). In addition to exhibiting the spiteful rhetorical bombast of a Fury, Medea also renders herself in maternal imagery. She finishes cursing and declares that "it is born, my vengeance is delivered: / I mothered it" (1.25-27). Yet Medea also demonstrates the original hybrid gendering of the Furies by adopting some masculine attributes; she exhibits a violent potency reflecting the fact that "vastly more men than women are convicted of vengeance-motivated murder" (Hall 51). Creon comments on Medea's power while rebuking her and demanding her exile. He believes that

Medea's mix of feminine vindictiveness and masculine efficacy threatens the kingdom, calling her "a scheming source of every criminal act / you have a woman's wickedness; your daring / shows masculine strength, ignoring what men say. / Go . . . and take with you / your deadly drugs" (2.266-270). When the incredulous Creon remarks that Medea's "daring" ignores "what men say," he betrays male anxiety over female suffering and the corresponding emotion it engenders. He seems to recognize that if wronged women such as Medea could realize the retributive promises embedded in their curses, they could upend and remake societies defined by "what men say."

As Medea ponders how to best turn Fury and execute her revenge against Creon and the others, she experiences a tumult of extreme emotions rendered through the imagery of dangerous and overpowering weather. The weather imagery used by those who watch Medea's flaming cheeks and frothing tears prefigures the way early modern writers also used similar natural imagery to convey the effects of accumulating humoral passions. Thomas Wright illustrates this pattern when comparing "the Soul without Passion to a calm Sea; with sweet, pleasant, and crispling streams; but the Passionate, to the raging Gulf swelling with waves, surging, menacing the stony rocks, and endeavoring to overthrow Mountains . . . never letting the Soul be in quietness, but ever either flowing with pleasure or ebbing with pain" (134). Using language that anticipates women's humoral inconstancy, Medea's nurse observes her mistress's turmoil and records it in elemental imagery. She explaining that Medea "runs to and fro, her movements wild, / her face displays her crazy passion's marks. / Her cheeks are flaming and she draws deep breaths, / she shouts, her eyes are wet with tears" (3.385-88). Medea runs the gamut of self-destructive emotions associated with impressionable women, exhibiting "the signs of every kind of passion. Hesitant, aggressive, raging, bitter, full of grief . . . Her madness froths over" (3.389-

92). Such a chaotic depiction of Medea conveys a particular image of jealous and spiteful femininity, as the Chorus later explains that "flame, wind's turbulent buffet, javelins, / none of these come down with a force so mighty, / none as fearful as when an ex-wife, rejected, / hates with hot passion" (3.579-82). While the play offers some attention to the way patriarchal edicts rob Medea of her family life, it more strongly emphasizes the melodramatic, sensational nature of Medea's angry feelings through its poetic imagery. This emphasis would help reinforce the erroneous notion that women's emotion was naturally and indubitably inclined toward the ungovernable and destructive, and more specifically, that jilted women were most likely to respond with spite and retribution rather than restraint.

Seneca's play reinforces these ideas not only through its stylistic conventions, but also through the character trajectory it charts for its titular female protagonist. The play's exposition identifies Medea's mission as not to emulate the moral mandates of Stoic emotional philosophy and work to reject anger, but to do the opposite and reject any other impulses that would temper anger. Kathrin Winter suggests that Medea possesses a "meta-textual awareness" of her own infamous wrath and heinous crimes, that "it is as if . . . Seneca's Medea has read Euripides' tragedy and knows the predetermined aspect of her identity and is self-consciously moving towards a recognizable trajectory of character and plot" (97). Medea's journey toward a more formidable anger suggests the difference between competent masculine and chaotic feminine scripts for affective governance: while a masculine response to dangerous affect entails subordinating that affect and behaving with restraint, a feminine response means capitulating to that affect and behaving without restraint. Parallel language in *Medea*'s exposition and conclusion helps illustrate that Medea demonstrates this feminine response to abandon restraint.

As described in her introductory soliloquy, Medea seeks to reject restraint by embracing negative affects that can nurture epic misdeeds:

> Evils to make heaven and earth shudder equally
>
> Are what my mind revolves: wounding, murder, death
>
> Creeping through the limbs. But all this is too slight;
>
> I did those as a girl. Let a weightier rage swell up:
>
> Now I have given birth, my crimes ought to increase.
>
> Take on the armor of anger, prepare for destruction
>
> Possessed by fury. The tale of your divorce
>
> Must match your marriage (44-53).

Here, Medea declares that she can accumulate a greater enmity through her maternal powers, thus associating feminine affect with an array of vindictive and violent feelings. She wants to surpass the "wounding, murder, death" she executed "as a girl," and expects to do so because she has grown as a woman and a mother: "Now I have given birth, my crimes ought to increase." Motherhood makes Medea a more dangerous enemy because it can increase pathos, which gives the mother a deeper reserve of empathetic feelings that can be turned to an inversely proportionate anger when husbands or children are threatened or removed. Helkiah Crooke, royal physician to James I, supports this idea in his anatomical text *Mikrokosmographia*, when he argues that "among rauenous Creatures the Females are most fierce, we say the loue they beare to their yong addeth spirits and courage vnto them" (277). Medea recognizes that maternal

ferocity can propel her toward the infamous posterity she seeks; it can help her orchestrate a "tale of divorce" that surpasses the sensational violence and copious amount of blood she wrought on Jason's behalf before their marriage.

After she establishes her desire to commit an ignominious and unprecedented revenge, Medea sometimes struggles to fully abandon the restraint that prevents her attaining this level of iniquity. If Medea indeed possesses the meta-textual knowledge that she's expected to commit notorious crimes, then the play establishes a conflict where she must reach this goal by repudiating any inclination to self-discipline or composure. In order to reach her expectations and those of readers across time periods, "Medea cannot understand restraint / for anger, or for love" (866-67). Medea most explicitly feels the burden of restraint in the moments before killing her children. As she wrestles with the terrible prospect of summoning them for the last time, Medea declares that the thought "hits my heart, my body turns to ice, / My chest is heaving. Anger has departed / the wife in me is gone. I am all mother again. / Is this me? Could I spill my own children's blood . . . No, no, what terrible madness!" (926-30). Here, Medea breaks from the normal precedent in which women protect their children with superhuman resolve and power, as her feminine identity is split between two roles: the guardian mother and the jealous wife. When she declares that anger departs and "the wife in me is gone, I am all mother again," Medea acknowledges that her maternal love temporarily subordinates her jealous rage and demands that she spare the children. She further details this internal battle between the two split halves of her feminine identity:

Why, my soul, do you waver? Why are my cheeks blotched with tears,

Why am I led in two directions, now by anger,

Now by love? My double inclination tears me apart.

As when the wild winds make their brutal wars

And on both sides the seas lift up the discordant waves,

And the unstable water boils: even so my heart

tosses and churns: love is chased out by rage

and rage by love. Resentment, yield to love (931-45).

Here, Medea uses the trope of turbulent weather imagery to convey her chaotic affective state. Her body is the site of "wild winds" and "brutal wars" where "love is chased out by rage and rage by love." In order to complete her expected narrative trajectory, though, Medea must disown this sudden outpouring of loving restraint and instead choose the path of anger. This predetermined conclusion speaks to the way representations of angry and irrational female affect remained pervasice across place and time, a misogynistic conception which *Medea* both relies on and reinforces.

Medea overcomes maternal restraint shortly after this moment of doubt, killing her children and further reinforcing depictions of unruly feminine affect. She defeats her motherly devotion by reexamining her split identity and reprioritizing her resentment over her affection. While hugging the children, Medea realizes that she's already lost them because "I must go in exile. / Any minute, they will be ripped from my arms, / weeping and wailing" (948-50). Since she's being stripped of her role as mother, Medea decides to similarly punish Jason by also forcing their father to "lose their kisses" (951). Her epiphany causes her love to abate and anger to reappear: "Again, my anger grows, / my hatred boils. My ancient Fury seeks my reluctant

hands again – anger, I follow your lead" (951-53). By declaring her allegiance to anger, Medea enters the frenetic state where restraint dissolves and passionate impulses determine behavior. As if the completion of her introductory invocation, the Furies appear to sanction Medea's desires. She sees "this violent crowd of Furies" approaching her (958), and asks them to "fix deep your torch in my eyes, / ravage me, burn me up, see, my whole breast is open for the Furies" (965-66). Medea rightfully declares that the added power of the Furies will help her reach her revenge and thus "prove to the people the things you can do" (977). Medea maintains her turn to Fury after killing the children, declaring that her "bitter heart" enjoys "slow crime," especially given that she gets to watch Jason's suffering (1016). Such gratuitousness illustrates a sensationalized representation of female affect where volatility and vindictiveness dominant reason and restraint.

Seneca employs the same feminine affective script in his later play *Hercules Furens*. Like *Medea,* this play opens with an angry female figure who declares her intention to abandon restraint and reach a rarefied level of anger. The play begins as Zeus's wife Juno lambastes Hercules, her husband's illegitimate son whose renowned feats of strength constantly remind her of the disgrace and infidelity she suffers. Juno's curse reflects a conscious level of affective intent, as she deliberately sets her mind to thoughts which invoke fury. Her meditations broadly exemplify how cursing "involves intensifying feelings of love for what is lost and of hate towards [a] murderer" or offender (Clare 229). In this case, Juno reaches amplifies her ire by lamenting the heavenly status that she's lost and blaming Hercules for this misfortune. She bemoans that she is "forsaken as wife . . . and left the lofty vaults of heaven . . . I've been driven from heaven to make room for his whores, forced to live here, on earth. Whores possess the sky now" (7). She identifies Hercules and his mother as the source of her downfall, declaring that the earth "teems with irreverent mothers – how often it has made me a stepmother! Alcmena may

triumph over me, ascend to heaven, take possession of my throne. Her son may obtain immortality and the stars his father promised him" (7). Such thoughts spur Juno to declare that "my hatred of him [Hercules] will never subside or abate: my anger will always live on, ever fresh, ever violent . . . I will wage war upon him until the end of time" (8). Juno invokes the Furies to sanctify her anger, embracing the feminine script of affective management by abandoning self-governance and embracing her furious urges. While demanding that the "Furies be roused from the deepest pits of Tartarus and summoned here" (9), she includes an explicit request that they unhinge her reason. By owning her ambition to insanity, Juno sets up an affective dichotomy that establishes the play's conflict. This conflict places Hercules in a situation where he must appropriately govern his anger; he will be tempted to emulate Juno and demonstrate the feminine script by acting on anger, but he must overcome this temptation and follow Stoic principles that direct one to mitigate destructive impulses.

The tenor and imagery of Juno's plea to the Furies illuminates the highly gendered nature of the play's affective dichotomy. She invokes the Furies through an appeal that constructs a feminine solidarity through madness, further associating femininity with affective extremity and impetuousness:

> Handmaidens of Dis, begin your destructive work, shake your burning pine torches . . . On with it! Gain your revenge for his desecration of your Stygian realm. Inflame his heart, stoke his mind with flames more violent than the fires that roil and churn within the volcanic furnaces of Etna. Yet, before we can ensnare the mind of Hercules and torment him into delirium, insanity, madness, I myself must first lose my own mind. Juno, why do you remain sane? Sisters! You must unhinge my mind first and shake me from my wits, if I am to execute a scheme worthy of a step-mother (10).

Here, Juno hopes to achieve a "destructive" escalation of hysterical anger, achieved through communion with "sisters" who "unhinge my mind and shake me from my wits." Such deliberate pursuit of irrationality allows Juno to "execute a scheme worthy of a step-mother." References to "sisters" and "step-mother" establish that feminine responses to emotion entail rejecting Stoic edicts to govern dangerous feelings by delaying their impact or tempering them with an opposite affect. Juno explicitly rejects these proper responses by repudiating self-governance, declaring that "I myself must first lose my own mind." Her commitment to anger conflates femininity with inappropriate and flawed responses to affect, thus juxtaposing femininity against the proper principles of Stoic affect management. In terms of the play, Juno's capitulation to madness represents a misguided course of action that Hercules must avoid. The play's central conflict, then, rests on a gendered dichotomy of affective governance where a masculine response includes restraint and a female response abandons it.

Juno advances this conflict after she turns Fury, using supernatural powers to project her affect onto Hercules. She wills him into a "delirium, insanity, madness" that addles his brain, causing him to murder his wife Megara and their children under the erroneous impression that they are a "flock of sacrificial victims" for the gods (41). After waking and observing the lurid results of his hallucinatory frenzy, Hercules seems poised to emulate Juno's example and willfully give in to his anger at himself. He initially believes that suicide offers the only path to redemption, declaring that "there is no reason why I should linger any longer in this hateful light . . . No one on earth could purify my polluted soul. Death, death is the only cure for this crime!" (49). But Hercules's earthly father Amphitryon and his friend Theseus clarify that suicide represents a true crime, unlike the murders of Megara and the children, which were not sanctioned by Hercules's free will. Their assertions reflect the Stoic understanding that true

emotions, judgments, and conscious behaviors are constituted by mental assent. Amphitryon illustrates this belief by trying to minimize the shame Hercules feels, asking him to consider "who would call a mistake a crime?" (48). In their assertion, Hercules remains blameless for the deaths of Megara and the children because he did not kill them of his own volition; it was Juno who clouded his mind and guided his weapons. But when Hercules declares his intention to kill himself, Amphitryon panics because his son is on the verge of "committing a crime willingly, intentionally!" (50). In this moment, Hercules comes dangerously close to violating a Stoic mandate where "suicide for emotional or passionate reasons is prohibited" (Evenepol 229). According to Stoic principles, the individual must avoid a rash suicide that that prevents one from facing the consequences of their actions, as to "flee into death (*ad mortem confugere*) is just as reprehensible as fleeing from death" (221). To steer Hercules from this cowardly path, Amphitryon and Thesus ask him to change his affective course; they "forbid Hercules from giving in to his anger" (*Hercules Furens* 49). Prompted by his male companions, Hercules must summon the strength to avoid the incorrect affective response modeled by Juno and instead choose a more stereotypically masculine response that includes restraint.

Hercules resolves this conflict by subordinating his fury and refusing to assent to any more violence. His decision contrasts with Juno's gleeful and deliberate perniciousness, which she owns most thoroughly when declaring that there is no reason to "entrust such hatred to someone else" (9). As Juno's foil, Hercules never takes similar ownership of violent desires despite the pressures they exert on him. His internal struggle to reject these feelings illustrate how, in Seneca's understanding, one may feel involuntary affects or pre-passions that leave impressions on the mind and body. Pre-passions may cause dangerous or destabilizing thoughts, but true feelings occur only when one's rational consciousness assents to the impulse they

present. When rejecting a pre-passion, the wise individual "may indeed be affected in some way, but that is merely the experience of being 'bowed down' under the assault [of the pre-passion]. It must be regarded as a different kind of phenomenon from what we identify as emotion" (Graver 307). Hercules feels these pressures up to a certain point, showed by his description of his internal agitation. Like Juno, the raging Hercules expresses intent to orchestrate an epic act of destruction, declaring that he will "heave up this whole mass of earth, which sits at the centre of the cosmos and separates heaven and hell, and bring it crashing down on my head" (Seneca 50). But unlike Juno, Hercules never acts upon these urges. He instead finds solace after an intervention by Amphitryon, who declares that he will follow suit if Hercules commits suicide. "Decide as you like," exclaims Amphitryon, "but be sure to remember . . . that your reputation is at stake and depends on what you do now: either you live or you kill again . . . I will plunge this sword deep into my decaying body. Here, they will say, lies the victim of sane Hercules" (50). By describing himself as the "victim of sane Hercules," Amphitryon establishes that Hercules must face account for his choices now that his wits are regained and his actions are deliberate. Amphitryon also alludes to the way men are expected to adhere to Stoic affect management principles when he mentions that Hercules's "reputation is at stake." If Hercules gives in to his anger, kills himself, and causes his father's subsequent suicide, he will go down in posterity as having capitulated to destructive affect in a feminine way. But because Hercules listens to his father and rejects anger, he ultimately models the Senecan sage who rejects bad impulses despite their effects on the body and mind. More broadly, his example associates masculinity with a properly restrained and moderated Stoic response to emotion, which contrasts with Juno's stereotypically feminine lack of restraint.

III: Humoral Theory and the Feminine Body

Ultimately, Seneca's depictions of Medea and Juno presented early modern scholars and artists with a negative stereotype of feminine affect, one which would further engrain the patriarchal ontology of humoral theory. By linking these characters to the Furies, Seneca reinforced a gendered conception of affect management that associated women with unrestrained and histrionic emotiveness. These depictions would lend credence to humoral theories which asserted that colder women were less capable of affective governance because of the natural disadvantages incurred by their temperatures. Early modern religious and scientific authorities held a vexed understanding of the female body. They assumed that even though women were cold by default, physiological fluctuations exclusive to women could cause the female body to be variously hot or cold. As a baseline, the authorities held that male bodies were warmer than female bodies, thus placing females lower in a system that "ranked all species thermally, distinguishing among the temperatures implied in their observable modes of reproduction" (Paster 78). Given that warmer bodies possessed higher levels of energy and vitality, women were assumed to be weaker than men in faculty and constitution. Though they concurred on the enervation caused by feminine coolness, period authorities also needed to justify the contradictory stigma positioning women as quick to anger and irascibility. Feminine anger seemed incommensurate with passive feminine coolness, given that humoral theory positioned anger as a product of increased bodily heat. To resolve this conflict, early modern physiologists asserted that the cold female body was more malleable and unstable than the warmer male body because it menstruated. Since women expelled and somehow replenished blood on a monthly basis, authorities maintained that these anatomical hydraulics evinced that the feminine body experienced corresponding temperamental fluctuations. They assumed that physiological

changes or external influences could cause the normally cold female body to temporarily produce the physiological prerequisite for anger: an excess of heated blood.

Helkiah Crooke, royal physician to James I, outlines the tension between the lassitude associated with the cool feminine body and a woman's perceived ability to quickly generate the anger and malice characteristic of a warm, active heart. Crooke's 1616 anatomical treatise *Mikrokosmographia* grants that women do have warm hearts, but maintains that pulmonary warmth and activity don't offer women their normal benefits because female bodies are designed for gestation. Crooke asserts "the heart of a woman is hotter than the heart of a man" because "the pulses of women are more quick and frequent, of men more rare and slow, as Galen teacheth . . . it is the property of colde to make the partes sluggish and dull in their motion" (273). Though an active heart and hot blood should predispose one toward agency and boldness, Crooke understands as menstruation as evidence that a woman's body diverted blood for procreative purposes. He explains that because of its perceived role in facilitating gestation, "the liuer of a woman is hotter then a man . . . the Naturall Faculty which hath his residence in the Liuer, and is diuided into the encreasing, nourishing and procreating vertues, is stronger in a woman then in a man" (274). These encreasing, nourishing and procreating vertues" are enabled by menstrual blood, as "women doth receiue & retaine a greater quantity of blood" in order to create the conditions necessary for birth, particularly male birth (276). This blood in the liver would be heated to produce a male fetus, which was "generated in a hotter place . . . on the right side, females on the left. Now we know that the right side is hotter then the left by reason of the Liuer . . . the Male being hotter spendeth more of the bloud gathered together in the wombe" (274-75). Because authorities like Crooke contended that women used their blood for generative purposes, it enabled misogynistic views that denied women the constancy which humoral theory

normally associated with copious warm blood. These hegemonic attitudes explained away physiological attributes that could have fostered more equitable views towards women, ultimately denying women potential benefits bestowed by their bodies.

Unfortunately, patriarchal interpretation of the female body did more than contravene a woman's physiological advantages; it invented new weaknesses to further entrench stereotypes of general female inconstancy and affective inferiority. Male anatomists argued that a woman's excess blood, while necessary for procreative and generative purposes, became a liability that often minimized a woman's ability to deliberately govern feeling. Crooke articulates this prevailing opinion by explaining that women's bodies are predisposed to the "faculty . . . of the heart which we called *Irascibilis* or the passion of Anger . . . many of vs know by woefull experience to bee quicker and more vigorous in woemen . . . for they are easily heated and vpon very slight causes" (273-74). When Crooke explains that women are "easily heated and vpon very slight causes," he references a stigma suggesting that women often entered unpredictable and irrational bouts of anger brought on by a sudden heating of the blood. He references classical sources to justify this stereotype, using Greek authorities to distinguish a woman's volatile and often impotent anger from a man's purposeful anger:

> In Hippocrates and Galen . . . Anger and Wrath are two distinct things. Anger is a disease of a weake mind which cannot moderate it selfe but is easily inflamed, such are women, childeren, and weake and cowardly men, and this we tearme fretfulnesse or pettishness: but Wrath which is *Ira permanes* belongs to stout heartes, and therefore *Homer* calleth Achilles Anger (275-76).

Crooke's definition helps clarify that male and female anger are differentiated by contrasting levels of affective governance. Most males, possessed of a thermal advantage that enabled stronger faculties, could better rebuff dangerous affects. They could mollify or manage anger, subordinating it to resist its effects, or channeling it toward a deliberate action or purpose. Crooke positions weak men and most women on an opposite extreme, specifically explaining that women are "easily mooued of the hindges" because of their "cold Temper, and from the impotencie and weaknes of their mind, because they are not able to lay a law vpon themselues" (277). Crooke's language reflects patriarchy's contradictory understanding of feminine humor: though a woman might be hot with anger, her "cold Temper" prevents her from "lay[ing] a law vpon" herself and managing her feelings. Such an understanding of feminine humor led to an idea that women would easily capitulate to rouge affects, especially anger, and quickly descend to histrionics or debasement.

Crooke's appraisal of feminine physiology and behavior reflects the broader early modern consensus that the female body's qualities predisposed women to irrationality and poor affective governance. Because this "evidence" was rooted in physiology and therefore seemed empirical, it allowed male authorities to quantify perceived female weaknesses and ensconce a patriarchal hierarchy, a social organization based on the idea that "the coldness and sponginess of female flesh" explained women's "limited capacity for productive agency, individuality, and higher reasoning" (Paster 79). Male authorities used a specific term to refer to women's assumed tendency to exhibit extreme or vacillating feelings: "inconstancy." In *Passions of the Mind in General*, Thomas Wright argues that lack of heat makes women susceptible to four common vices including inconstancy, which he describes as making "change or alternation of that purpose or resolution" which one "had prudently determined before" (131). He maintains that like unwise

or immature men, cold women showed "lack of prudence and judgment in their determinations . . . young men and women for the most part resolve rashly and perform rarely" (120). To the medical and religious authorities of the period, female inconstancy was a deliberate component of "a divinely created natural order in which . . . the structure and functions of the human body . . . display the creator's intentions for the natural and social world" (Mercer 186). In the patriarchal structure of the early modern period, then, woman's perceived coldness and the weaknesses engendered of it substantiated Biblical depictions of female subordination, such as when "Paul insists in the New Testament, "A woman must quietly receive instruction with entire submissiveness . . . I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man' (Timothy 2:12)" (198). Because medical and religious discourses were constructed by men with an eye toward maintaining a patriarchal hierarchy, they provided men with ways to justify female subordination.

In these patriarchal discourses, women were thought to require extra effort and attention to dissipate the problematic humoral extremes unique to their bodies. Period authorities constructed whole medical categories for maladies caused by the physiological fluctuations of the female body. Robert Burton discusses some of these illnesses in *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, asserting that a woman's "heart and brain" may be "offended with those vicious vapors which come from menstruous blood" (1.414). Burton explains that women of all ages experience such illnesses, as they can afflict young women whose hormones are just beginning to activate or "widows . . . by reason of a sudden alteration of their accustomed course of life" (1.415). Burton prescribes physical or sexual activity to aid women in alleviating humors that accumulate to cause ill health. He maintains that they can be dissipated by hard labor, explaining that "seldom should you see a hired servant, a poor handmaid . . . kept hard to her work and bodily labor, a

coarse country wench, troubled in this kind" (1.417). In addition to work, sex also improved a woman's affective condition by facilitating a release that led to clarity of mind. He argues that "the best and surest remedy" for female melancholy "is to see them [women]. . . married to good husbands in due time" (1.417). The Anglican Burton highlights the importance of regular sex through a liberal critique of Catholic celibacy, inveighing strenuously against the "odious and abominable . . . superstitious and rash vows of popish monasteries, so to bind and enforce men and women to vow virginity, to lead a single life, against the laws of nature, opposite to religion, policy, and humanity, so to starve, to offer violence, to suppress the vigor of youth!" (1.418). His language alludes to the erratic physical symptoms of a humoral malady, accusing Catholicism of "impiously contemn[ing]" the "tears, sighs, groans, and grievous miseries of those poor souls committed to their charge" (1.418). In Burton's view, Catholic dogma guarantees physiological chaos in their clergy because they forbid priests and nuns from performing "that to which by their innate temperature they are so furiously inclined, urgently carried, and sometimes precipitated, even irresistibly led" (1.418). By attaching such crucial importance to work and sex, Burton illustrates how early modern authorities understood female bodies as overstimulated vessels of humor requiring extra maintenance to function properly

IV: *Titus Andronicus*

Shakespeare's Tamora most explicitly illustrates the synthesis between the archetype of the Furies and the humoral understanding of volatile feminine affect. Tamora's rhetoric and behavior illustrate the unnatural and destructive anger embedded in each stereotype. She exemplifies "the archetypical woman turned monstrous revenger," the aggrieved woman who

looks back to the example of the "ancient mothers" Medea and Juno (Findlay 76). Like her female forbearers, Tamora shares characteristics attributed to the Furies: their unmitigated rage and vindictive spite; a penchant for grotesque rhetorical bombast and unceasing, cacophonic cursing; and a monomaniacal obsession with executing a triumphant, theatrical revenge. Tamora takes on this association early in the play, when she obviates the audience's sympathy for her maternal loss by rededicating herself as a hateful figure who seeks the destruction of her enemies, the Andronici. She will find "a day to massacre them all, / And raze their faction and their family, / The cruel father and their traitorous sons" (1.1.450-52). Tamora's rhetoric in her next appearance crackles with the chaotic din of the Furies. She tells her sons that she has seen an "abhorred pit . . . at the dead time of night" where "a thousand fiends, a thousand hissing snakes, / Ten thousand swelling toads, as many urchins, / Would make such fearful and confused cries, / As any mortal body hearing it / Should straight fall mad, or else die suddenly" (2.3.98-104). In these lines, Tamora invokes all three thematic associations that Edith Hall locates within the "emblematized" femininity of the Furies, which was "consolidated in ritual, mythopoeia, literature, and philosophy by their chthonic, thantalogical, and maternal associations . . . and their similarity and sometimes partial assimilation to other female figures including the Harpies" (50). Tamora amalgamates the underground, deathly, and maternal hallmarks of the Furies through this speech describing subterranean horrors and madness, which she delivers to urge her sons to murder on her behalf, else "be ye not henceforth call'd my children" (2.3.113). These attributes show that early modern writers who depicted female anger and madness were indebted to classical representations of the Furies.

While Tamora emulates the stock attributes of the Furies, she also understands her affective disposition through humoral notions which add more dynamic qualities to the more

static Senecan model. In addition to acknowledging how material and environment factors might induce affect, Tamora understands that her feelings can be easily transmitted thanks to the porous and vulnerable nature of the humoral body. Tamora most explicitly amalgamates the literary representation of the Furies with early modern Galenic medical tenets in the play's final act, when she costumes herself like the female personification of Revenge in order to confuse Titus. She wears a "strange and sad habiliment" in order to appear as a Fury-esque entity (5.2.1), taking on the Furies' classic association with "murder and death" in dark, womb-like places such as "a hollow cave or lurking-place" (5.2.34-35). Tamora performs this identity not for its own sake, but because humoral theory stipulates that bodies can transmit affect to each other. By embodying destabilizing affect and presenting it to her enemy, she hopes to intensify his perceived insanity and weaken him. She intends to outwardly match what she perceives as "his lunacy," commanding her similarly costumed sons to emulate whatever "I forge to feed his brain-sick humors, / Do you uphold and maintain in your speeches, / For now he firmly takes me for Revenge" (5.2.70-72). Even though Tamora misjudges her opponent's credulity "in this mad thought" (5.2.76), her plan to "feed his brain-sick humors" relies on humoral notions of transmissible affect and impressionable bodies. Through this understanding, Tamora illustrates how early modern depictions of female affect often combine characteristics of the Furies with Galenic medical conceits.

Because she appears associated with the Furies and deliberately attempts to transmit madness, Tamora seems estranged from cultural notions of femininity. Her behavior contradicts period gender ideologies prompting women to work diligently to reject bodily inclinations to affective or behavioral extremes. These directives "cautioned against displays of passion . . . Women should 'allay or abate these passionate furies,' 'parley with reason,' and 'chastise all

such innovating motions as disquiet the inward repose of the mind'" (Clare 227). Tamora's aberrant femininity explicitly appears when Lavinia begs Tamora to stop Chiron and Demetrius from raping her. This exchange offers a contrast in which Lavinia represents proper femininity through her insistence that Tamora restrain the destructive impulses motivating her and her children, a course of action aligned with Senecan teaching. Conversely, Tamora represents a feminine antithesis through her refusal to govern her vengeance and her children's lust, appetites which are rendered in humoral language. Lavina fruitlessly appeals to Tamora by invoking a sense of feminine solidarity, imploring her to "show a woman's pity" (2.3.147). But Tamora refuses to restrain her anger at the Andronici because "I poured forth tears in vain / To save your brother from the sacrifice, / But fierce Andronicus would not relent . . . use her as you will; / The worse to her, the better lov'd of me" (2.3.163-67). Her desire for revenge unrestrained and unabated, Tamora gleefully "let[s] my spleenful sons this trull deflow'r" (2.3.191). By characterizing her sons as "spleenful," Tamora suggests that she is poised to allow her sons to be guided by their physiological desires rather than by moral precepts that encourage restraint and governance. In contrast to the self-controlled ideal to which Lavinia appeals, Tamora and her children emulate the example of a Medea or Juno by rejecting restraint and instead choosing to amplify their base, destructive feelings.

Lavinia's rhetoric makes it even clearer that Tamora's affective response contradicts cultural rules for idealized feminine conduct, which prohibited violence while encouraging submissiveness and empathy. Lavinia's response highlights a pervasive criticism that all female revengers must negotiate. Because violence and revenge deviate from feminine codes of conduct, women who take revenge are often subject to more scrutiny and judgment than their male counterparts. In other words, association with the "feminine" Furies removes a woman from

idealized femininity and instead positions her as an aberrant figure confirming negative humoral stereotypes of feminine anger. Lavina's language emphasizes the unfeminine nature of Tamora and her affective disposition. She maintains some hope that social constructions of meek and sympathetic womanhood might have some influence over Tamora, imploring her to act a feminine part and be "a gentle queen / And with thine own hands kill me in this place!" (2.3.168). But after being rebuffed by Tamora, Lavina's rhetoric changes to reflect not the possibility that Tamora might perform femininity, but the fact that Tamora's identity is wholly antithetical to it. She equates Tamora's excessive brutality with unfeminine monstrosity, declaring that her captor possesses not an ounce of "grace, no womanhood – ah, beastly creature, / The blot and enemy to our general name!" (2.3.182-83). No longer a woman because of her refusal to disperse any modicum of restraint or mercy, Tamora becomes for Lavinia a "beastly creature" who ruins the collective female reputation. Ultimately, while audiences might remain rightfully appalled by Tamora, the language in this exchange reflects how women who engage with angry or violent affects are judged against a gender ideal that does not exist for their male counterparts.

Lavinia's rape scene further confirms this double standard because it spends more time interrogating the conduct of the rapists' mother and commenting on her gender performance, while neglecting to spend an equal amount of attention on the rapists themselves. Lavinia herself makes some concession for Chiron and Demetrius by acknowledging that their ruthlessness comes from their mother's unnatural and unfeminine disposition, positioning her as the source of their hard and merciless attitudes: "O, do not learn her wrath – she taught it thee; / The milk thou suck'st from her did turn to marble, / Even at thy teat thou hadst thy tyranny" (2.3.143-45). By focusing on the way that Chiron and Demetrius took milk from their mother, Lavinia de-

emphasizes their individual choices and instead positions Tamora as the principal agent of the rape. Humoral theory posited that suckling infants could adopt a mother or nurse's affective disposition through breastfeeding, given that "breast milk was simply womb blood transformed through the action of maternal love" (Johnson 139). An evil or unloving mother or nurse could feed "treachery" to their infants, "whose appetites were formed first in the womb and then at the breast—appetites that emerged again at adolescence and that (if they met with 'unnatural food') would . . . 'make a devil of a saint'" (139). Chiron demonstrates that he has physiologically inherited his mother's perverse disposition when Lavinia asks for his intercession, rejecting her by retorting if "thou would have me prove myself a bastard?" (2.3.148). Here, Chiron equates mercy and kindness with bastardry because they contradict the cruel affective register to which he is predisposed, thanks to his consumption of his mother's milk; loyalty to his mother means deliberately maintaining this cruelty. Because she depicts Chiron and Demetrius as products of their mother's physiological material, Lavinia places a majority of the blame for her rape onto Tamora. She delivers this blame alongside an interrogation and repudiation of Tamora's gender performance, but neglects to spend the same energy critiquing her rapists in a gendered way. This imbalance shows many female figures who engage with vengeance and violence must deal with gendered stereotypes that don't exist for males.

V: *The Spanish Tragedy*

In *Titus Andronicus*, Tamora exhibits the classic tropes of grotesque female revenge that early modernity imported from Greek and Roman sources, including Senecan drama. And in a reflection of Galenic principles, she also iitllustrates how the vindictive attitudes of the Furies are

especially dangerous in the early modern milieu because of the period's stronger emphasis on affective transmissibility. In terms of affect management, Tamora chooses to embrace and intensify her initial anger, so she presents a negative example which fails to highlight how women might be able to practice affective governance and resist the attitudes ascribed to them by humoral theory. Unlike Tamora, *The Spanish Tragedy*'s Bel-Imperia offers a more sympathetic depiction of the female avenger. Clare notes that Bel-Imperia's beauty and intelligence makes *The Spanish Tragedy* "one of the few plays to resist the image of the aberrant female revenger" (119). In addition to the fact that Bel-Imperia rejects the ignoble image of the Furies, critics also identify her as an agentic player in the text, a resistor of patriarchal structure, and ultimately a powerful symbol of feminine autonomy. Christopher Crosbie explains that the canny Bel-Imperia combats patriarchy because she "flouts the boundaries of class divisions" and "defies expectations of female complaisance . . . Her downward selection of lovers remains an expression of ambitious growth precisely because it is a *selection*" (20). Chloe Preedy locates Bel-Imperia's agency not only in the aristocratic status that enables her choices, but through her intellectual competence and commitment to "learning and literary skills . . . women's learning becomes a weapon of revenge: the silenced tongue supplanted by the martial pen" (184). Some critics even read powerful agency in Bel-Imperia's unscripted suicide during her performance of *Soliman and Perseda*, since it destabilizes a kingdom and inspires "wonder at her boldness" (Brown 61). These scholars rightly point out that Bel-Imperia's grace and competence elevate her above other female revengers, ultimately distancing her from many of the Furies' repulsive attributes.

Bel-Imperia demonstrates laudable intelligence and agency throughout the play, but her death represents a point of ambiguity that obscures whether or not she deliberately manages

affect. Since humoral theory understood the cold female body as harder to govern and more prone to irrational outbursts, Bel-Imperia's death might be read to confirm these negative stereotypes regardless of her intention. The male characters around Bel-Imperia indeed interpret her death as a moment of weakness corroborating their negative conceptions about feminine affect, including the belief that humoral imbalances could result in female self-harming. Bel-Imperia partially allows this interpretation through her silence, as she dies in the context of the play-within-a-play and thus neglects to voice her intentions in a way that would contradict humoral expectations. This silence also means that Bel-Imperia does not fulfill the revenger's normal prerogative to reveal their orchestration of vengeance, to show their mastery by rhetorically reveling in their opponent's suffering. More importantly, because Bel-Imperia dies without giving a final address identifying her feelings and choices, she leaves observers to assume that she dies emoting the vengeful register she maintains throughout the play, which appears when she chooses to develop a "second love" with Horatio in order to "spite the prince that wrought his [Andrea's] end" (1.4.66-8), and in her bloody writ instructing Hieronimo to "revenge Horatio's death, / And fare better than Bel-Imperia doth" (3.2.30-31). If this is the case, Bel-Imperia might act as a good model illustrating how to delay the destabilizing effects of intense feeling. However, she does not exemplify how one might reject and replace destructive feelings for social or moral reasons. Because of the ambiguity surrounding her death, Bel-Imperia occupies a middle ground between Tamora and Martha. She may demonstrate some principles of performative affective management, but a better example remains elsewhere.

Bel-Imperia may be best viewed as an illustration of delay, given that she deliberately delays acting on her anger until the proper moment. Instead of immediately attacking her brother Lorenzo and the Portuguese prince Balthazar for murdering her second lover Horatio, she

acknowledges the need to "constrain myself, / To patience, and apply me to the time, / Till heaven . . . shall set me free" (3.9-12-14). Bel-Imperia emphasizes this impressive emotional restraint in conversation with these two enemies, who have placed her in prison as punishment for her reluctance to entertain a match with Balthazar. Lorenzo justifies the imprisonment by relying on humoral stereotypes of destructive female affect, which prompted the male aristocrats to quarantine Bel-Imperia for her and their own safety. He claims that her excess "melancholy" at "your first favorite Don Andrea's death" has displeased their father the king (3.10-70-71). Proximity to his displeasure would, according to Lorenzo, "add more fuel to your fire, / Who burnt like Etna for Andrea's loss" (3.10.76-77). Because humoral theory held that women were prone to dangerous emotional fluctuations, Lorenzo and Balthazar assume that they can exhibit control over Bel-Imperia's body both for her own safety and for the emotional health of the court.

Bel-Imperia's composed demeanor and clear arguments refute the stereotypes that allow Lorenzo and Balthazar to justify their abduction of her. She chastises Lorenzo for treating her like an enemy, isolating her for no reason. She asks why he has:

> Used thy sister so.
>
> First, to affright me with thy weapons drawn,
>
> And with extremes abuse my company;
>
> And then to hurry me like whirlwind's rage,
>
> Amidst a crew of confederates,
>
> And clap me up where none might come at me,

Nor I at any, to reveal my wrongs.

What maddening fury did possess thy wits?

Or wherein is't that I offended thee? (3.10.27-36).

In this address, Bel-Imperia flips the script and rightly depicts her brother as the more emotionally irrational body. She acknowledges that some type of misplaced feeling or judgment has caused Lorenzo to torment her in inexplicable ways, from "affright[ing] me with weapons drawn" to kidnapping her in a "whirlwind's rage." When she asks Lorenzo "what maddening fury did possess thy wits," Bel-Imperia correctly identifies that he emulates the distraught and unreasonable example set by the Furies. Through this intellect and composure, Bel-Imperia models delay to refute easy categorization as a stereotypically unhinged female avenger.

And yet, despite the fact that Bel-Imperia demonstrates laudable affective restraint for a majority of the play, the final scene complicates our understanding of the way she governs affect. Is she a competent and consistent governor of affect whose death occurs by choice, as an escape from patriarchal structure? Or does she indeed kill herself in error after being swept away by abundant passion, as Hieronimo suggests? Even critics who laud Bel-Imperia's actions acknowledge the complexity of this question, noting the difficulty of "explain[ing] the unsolved mystery of Bel-Imperia's suicide" (Brown 60). Preedy reads "independence" in Bel-Imperia's "alteration . . . to Hieronimo's script: he intended her to feign suicide, but she continues along her self-determined trajectory" (190). But even though Preedy appreciates Bel-Imperia's autonomy, she refuses to fully celebrate it because the suicide fits a pattern where "the active involvement of women in the dramatic revenge action remains inseparable from physical suffering, bodily weakness, and personal sacrifice" (195). And because it occurs without context,

unaccompanied by a clear rationale positioning it as an act of resistance, Bel-Imperia's suicide fails to explicitly challenge these narratives undermining feminine physiology and agency. The play's conclusion ultimately reveals a gendered prejudice prioritizing the male revenger's voice over the female's voice, given that the other characters spend a disproportionate amount of energy demanding that Hieronimo "speak . . . bloody murderer speak! / For now I have thee I will make the speak" (4.4.163-64). Though he lacks any special insight regarding Bel-Imperia's motivations or interior affective condition, Hieronimo nonetheless gets the final word on Bel-Imperia's death and its implications. Unfortunately, his commentary continues a pattern in which early modern women's assumed bodily weaknesses justified the way male figures were given expert authority on matters of the female body or female behavior.

The male response to Bel-Imperia's death reflects patriarchal investment in humoral notions of feminine coolness and inconstancy. Bel-Imperia may be performing a significant act of resistance against the male-dominated hegemonic structures which constrain her, but notions of feminine bodily weakness allow the male onlookers to dismiss her death as a spontaneous but tragic misjudgment. After Hieronimo suggests that Bel-Imperia mistakenly killed herself in a moment of excessive passion, he and the play's other characters accept this explanation and move on without any extra wonder at or investigation of her final intentions. Hieronimo explains that:

> Poor Bel-Imperia missed her part in this,
>
> For though the story saith she should have died,
>
> Yet I of kindness and of care to her,
>
> Did otherwise determine of her end:

But love of him whom they did hate too much,

Did urge her resolution to be such (4.4.140-45).

Hieronimo describes Bel-Imperia's feelings in a manner consistent with the way humoral theory painted female affect as contradictory and ungovernable. In his assessment, Bel-Imperia deserves pity because conflicting affective extremes – "love of him" and anger at those who hated and killed him – urged her toward this misguided "resolution." Not only does humoral theory prevent the men from assuming that her death might hold purpose or significance, but it also prevents them from giving Bel-Imperia full intellectual credit as Hieronimo's co-conspirator. Though Hieronimo has already eulogized Bel-Imperia and thus implicated her in the revenge plot, Castile asks him "who where thy confederates in this?" (4.4.176) The Portuguese Viceroy responds by clarifying the obvious fact that it was Bel-Imperia, that "by her hand my Balthazar was slain" (4.4.178). However, the King and Castile seem unwilling to consider that Hieronimo could orchestrate such a stunt with the help of just a single female partner. In a move suggesting that he believes Hieronimo had other accomplices, the King calls for "the tortures. / Traitor as thou art, I'll make thee tell" (4.4.183-84). Because they mistakenly understand female affect and behavior through the limiting and discriminatory lens of humoral theory, the men at the play's conclusion seem incapable of interpreting Bel-Imperia's death in a way that provides any real insight.

Specific humoral theories about feminine affect and self-harm would have conditioned these characters to respond to Bel-Imperia's with callous disinterest, given that it conforms to expected stereotypes. According to *Passions of the Mind in General*, thinking of a specific emotional state could cause physiological shifts within the body. Wright maintains that impressions from the imagination cause "purer spirits" to "flock from the brain by certain secret

channels to the heart, where they pitch at the door, signifying what . . . was presented" (123). Wrathful impressions increase the heart's amount of "blood and choler" (123). Such alternations in blood quantity or flow had long been thought to negatively impact female mental health. Christina Mercer recounts from Hippocrates's *Diseases of Women* to show humoral theory's insistence that women afflicted with excess blood may behave erratically or even commit self-harm, specifically providing his example of pubescent girls "bleeding 'copiously,' but the blood will 'have no means of egress' so that it 'leaps up . . . to the diaphragm.' The result of this are symptoms that include aggression and the tendency for girls to 'leap around, to fall down into wells and to hang themselves,' and to 'take on a desire for death . . . as if it were a good thing'" (189-90). These ideas prompt *The Spanish Tragedy* to position Hieronimo as the stronger symbol of resistance, even though humoral theory maintains that men are not immune to the fits of self-harm thought to be more common to women. According to Burton, men afflicted with excess melancholic can suffer a "heavy heart, irksome thoughts crucify his soul, and in an instant he is moped or weary of his life, he will kill himself" (1.406). But because Hieronimo's suicide contravenes a direct order from the King, he appears more as a deliberately defiant figure and less an unruly body dominated by affect. Though Hieronimo and Bel-Imperia jointly perform the same revenge and meet similar ends, prejudiced humoral theories cause the play's characters to respond to each revenger according to a gendered hierarchy.

VI: *The Tragedy of Hoffman or a Revenge for a Father*

Bel-Imperia presents a model of female affective governance that in some ways resists and in some ways conforms to humoral expectations. She contradicts the lurid representations of

the Furies, while illustrating some restraint by practicing Senecan delay. However, because her ambiguous death fails to explicitly counteract the default humoral explanation for her suicide, Bel-Imperia remains burdened by sexist conceits of feminine weakness. More importantly, because she delays rather than displaces her initial desire for revenge, Bel-Imperia neglects to demonstrate early modernity's most powerful affect management strategy, which was to replace an unwanted affect by performing an opposite one. However, Martha, mother of the slain Prince Otho from Chettle's *Hoffman*, does illustrates this strategy through successful negotiation of vengeful affect. Martha not only demonstrates Senecan delay by waiting until the right moment to avenge, but her planning adds an extra layer: she ensures that her role in a communal revenge plot adheres to feminine standards that discourage direct violence. This accommodation requires Martha to counteract anger and grief using Senecan-inspired methods, but it achieves significant results. She ultimately plays a crucial role in revenging her son's murder while retaining sympathy from the audience.

By successfully negotiating the tension between revenge and patriarchal standards, Martha occupies the dual positions of revenger and gentlewoman. Meeting these contradictory sets of demands means that Martha performs with more affective and intellectual competency than any male revenge counterpart. Her commendable affective discipline contrasts with the failures of her antagonist, the eponymous villain Clois Hoffman. Martha and Hoffman both vow to determine their affective states, but in a reversal of paradigms of feminine weakness, only Martha succeeds. Martha's clear judgment and exemplary self-governance, coupled with Hoffman's failures, suggests that performative affect management tools were seen as powerful enough to counteract the humoral theories which so vigorously insisted on women's weakness. Though early modern authorities maintained that male and female bodies operated under wildly

different affective conditions, the character comparison at *Hoffman's* center suggests that a strong mind could compensate for a particular body's weaknesses and nullify perceived humoral disadvantages.

Hoffman's titular character introduces the theme of affective governance in the play's very first lines. In his introductory soliloquy, Hoffman takes stock of his emotional state and vows to maintain a vengeful affect in order to avenge his father, a naval commander who was spuriously and unfairly convicted of piracy and then summarily executed by the Duke of Luningberg. He repudiates "clouds of melancholy! / I'll no longer be subject to your schisms" (1.1.1-2). And in place of melancholy, Hoffman instead courts a bold and bloody humor: "But thou dear soul, whose nerves and arteries / In dead resoundings summon up revenge, / And thou shalt ha't; but be appeased . . . With a heart as air, swift as thought / I'll execute justly in such a cause. Where truth leadeth, what coward would not fight?" (1.1.3-10). Here, Hoffman suggests that his mind dominates the material components which inform his affective state. He locates both agency and feeling in his "dear soul," which seems to own his "nerves and arteries." And by describing his heart as "swift as thought," Hoffman insinuates that his body's physiological apparatuses will immediately recognize and process his intentions. This perceived ability to manage feeling reflects the high level of affective agency that humoral theory afforded to men, who were "hotter . . . his minde should be bee stout and inuincible to vndergoe dangers . . . the onely hearing whereof will driue a woman as wee say out of her little wits" (Crooke 275). Seemingly armed with the ability to control superhuman levels of wrath and ire, Hoffman swears revenge on Luningberg "or any man that is allied; / Has but one ounce of blood, of which he's part" (1.1.68-69). He later makes good on this vow by tricking and murdering Prince Otho, Martha's shipwrecked son and heir to the seat of Luningberg. Hoffman's attitude at this early

juncture seems to reflect powerful affective agency, but his later mistakes combined with Martha's discipline will challenge humoral notions of physiological makeup and gendered affective competency.

Hoffman maintains his affective competency for the first three acts of the play, balancing his anger with clear judgment to rack up a high body count. Having stolen Otho's identity, traveled to Luningberg's court, and eliminated rival claimants to power, Hoffman seems poised to usurp the Duke's authority. His accomplice Lorrique correctly identifies that only one person can stop their plans, and that this individual must be eliminated. Lorrique speaks of "beauteous Martha" (4.1.43), who is on her way to court and will surely recognize that the recently returned "Prince Otho" is actually a pretender who has stolen her son's royal identity. Hoffman and Lorrique create an opportunity to murder a sleeping Martha, but after recognizing Martha's beauty, Hoffman experiences the affective changeability that humoral theory associated with female bodies. As he observes Martha's sleeping figure, Hoffman experiences an awakening of sexual desire that mitigates his bloodlust and prevents him from fatally striking. He illustrates Wright's definition of inconstancy through his inability to follow through with his murderous intentions, refusing to stab Martha because "weapons draw blood, bloodshed will plainly prove / The worthy duchess . . . was murdered" (4.2.65-67). He then fails to smother her because "circles of purple blood will change the hue / Of this white porphyry; and the red lines . . . will tell the world / She died by violence" (4.2.78-81). When Hoffman similarly refuses to murder Martha using a small box of poison powder, Lorrique correctly identifies that Hoffman is smitten by desire and has become irrational. He demands of Hoffman, "Will you confound yourself by dotage? Speak" (4.2.91). When Martha awakens and demands Hoffman's identity, he addresses her using weather imagery suggesting that his affective state has changed significantly. Hoffman

offers Martha his real identity, asking to her remember that she cried at his father's execution; her tears were like "mercies poured on him and me / That like cool rain somewhat allayed the heat / Of our sad torment, and red sufferings" (4.2.142-44). Hoffman's affective shift certainly includes the sexual desire that prompts him to blazon Martha instead of killing her, but it also includes another component. In a reflection of early modern ideas of affective transmission, the pity that Martha once showed Hoffman reappears in his mind and helps dissipate his anger like the cool rain.

Once alone onstage, Hoffman delivers a soliloquy explaining his alteration from vengeful to libidinous. This soliloquy firmly establishes that Hoffman models a stereotypically feminine response to affect, one where the mind is unable to counteract the body's humoral impulses. He explains that:

> Another fire
>
> Burns in this liver: lust and hot desire
>
> Which you [Martha] must quench. Must? Ay, and shall: I know
>
> Women will like however they say no;
>
> And since my heart is knit unto her eyes
>
> If she, being sanctimonious, hate my suit
>
> In love, this course I'll take: if she deny,
>
> Force her. True, so *si non blanditus, vi* (4.2.218-25).

When Hoffman declares that another fire of "lust and hot desire" has ignited "in this liver," he unmistakably points to an affective shift that replaces anger with desire. Emphasizing his liver would have clearly sent this signal to early modern spectators, who were all too familiar with the liver as the source of choleric humors that determined sexual appetite. His sudden rejection of the sanguine mode propelling his revenge reflects a tired stereotype of female bodies and sexualities, namely that cold women were more lascivious because they lacked the wherewithal to govern desire. Crooke declares that "Females are more wanton and petulant than Males . . . because of the impotencie of their minds; for the imaginations of lustfull women are like the imaginations of bruite beastes which have no repugnancie or contradiction of reason to restrain them" (277). Hoffman refutes this humoral prejudice by projecting this same destabilizing and unrestrained lust. The rest of the soliloquy betrays Hoffman's ironic lack of self-awareness, since he erroneously assumes that he can seduce Martha because she – and other women – naturally exhibit the affective malleability that he himself displays in his shift from revenge to desire. He believes that because "women will like however they say no," he can impress his liver's "lust and hot desire" onto her. This blind understanding of impressionable women rests on the humoral theory that "cold temperature tamps down individuality by preventing the free flow of bodily humors necessary for its real expression," producing a "changeability inimical to . . . self-identity" (Paster 80). Since women like Martha were thought to be blank affective canvases, Hoffman thinks he can induce Martha to desire simply by presenting an example for her to emulate, by brandishing "my heart . . . unto her eyes." Hoffman's inconstancy and misjudgment will contrast with Martha's discipline, providing an example which resists stereotypes elevating male affective governance over female governance.

If Hoffman exhibits an affective shift characteristic of a woman or a weak man, then Martha offers an example of consistency normally associated with a stout-hearted man or a remarkable woman. She thus forcefully resists early modern assumptions that women were emotionally malleable. Her emotional equilibrium may come partly from her status as an older widow, as a woman who has passed the period where virginal or youthful aliments were more common. But even though her passions have likely mellowed with age, Martha's equilibrium most prominently stems from a sense of mental acuity strong enough to enable mastery over affect. She implements the Senecan strategies for affect management that I discuss in the introduction to this dissertation, specifically using delay and opposite affects to maintain her wits and plot a revenge course that accommodates her femininity to the demands of blood repayment. Martha's clarity of mind allows her room to maintain the bearing of aristocratic femininity and fulfill demands of revenge, specifically by forming a revenge coalition with other characters and playing a central but non-violent role within this group. Because of this arrangement, the humoral and cultural stereotypes associated with female revenge never imperil Martha's image. Her example reflects real-life patterns where "men have always carried out more acts of the violent reprisal which the Erinyes symbolize than women" (Hall 35). By leaving the violence to the men, Martha never allows the revenger's bloodlust to supersede her grieving, sympathetic maternal ethos or the graceful decorum befitting a lofty Duchess. At the same time, though, her direct and crucial participation in the revenge plot fully satisfies the demands of blood reprisal and cements her as an avenger.

Before realizing that Hoffman has lied about trying to save Otho, Martha exhibits a level of fracturing sorrow associated with the ostensibly more malleable female body. She seems resigned to the doleful inactivity of mourning her son; she asks Hoffman to take her to Otho's

body, where she will "build me a cell, / Made like a tomb; till death therein I'll dwell" (4.2.197-98). But after learning that Hoffman murdered Otho, Martha uses delay to stave off destabilizing grief. She then works to force a full confession from Lorrique. "I charge thee," she demands of Lorrique, "setting by all circumstance, / Thou utter what thou knowest: my heart is steel, / Nor can it suffer more than it doth feel" (5.1.177-79). In declaring her heart "steel," Martha vows to delay grief and withstand its effects on reason, so that she may come to better understand and better retaliate against Hoffman's villainy. She then orders Lorrique to continue recalling the sickening details of Otho's murder: "Go on, I am confident to hear all cruelty; / And I am resolved to act some, if no hand / Will attempt the murderer's end but mine" (5.1.200-02). In these lines, Martha specifically repudiates Crooke's contention that simply hearing misfortune could "driue a woman . . . out of her little wits" (Crooke 275). She then suggests that her newfound mental clarity actually comes from the desire for revenge: "I that never knew revenge's power, / Have entertained her newly in my breast" (5.1.246-47). Here, Martha behaves less like a stereotypical woman prone to fall apart at the slightest emotional turmoil. Instead, she demonstrates a masculine affective competency by subordinating grief to "revenge's power" and maintaining enough rationality to plan an effective revenge. In this case, Martha makes the same vow that Hoffman offers at the play's introduction, but she will end up performing revenge with more disipline and consistency.

Martha's revenge incorporates both feminine gender ideals and fulfills the avenger's duty. Her beauty and feminine charms initiate the revenge, and then she helps complete it through essential but non-violent action. Specifically, Martha serves as the sexual bait that leads Hoffman to his demise, and then she acts prudently to safeguard her assembled allies from his wrath. After Hoffman propositions her for a tryst, Martha feigns agreement and requests that

they enter a cave where her companions await. Stage directions clarify that she takes his sword during the walk to the cave. After entering the cave, Martha calls out to her hidden conspirators, letting them know that they can safely confront the villain. "Thy weapon's sure," she exclaims while holding Hoffman's sword, "the prize is ours. / Come forth dear friends, murder is in our powers" (5.3.120-22). At her command, the co-conspirators appear from the shadows and an unnamed Lord makes to execute Hoffman in the same way that Hoffman killed Otho, by placing on his head a "crown made flaming hot with fire" (5.3.142). Martha responds to Hoffman's execution without excess of violence or even malice, imploring him to reconcile with God: "Call upon heaven, base wretch, think on thy soul" (5.3.163). Having completed her role as an avenger who engineers the villain's death in a deliberate way, Martha returns to playing a non-violent, feminine role. Janet Clare argues that in English revenge tragedies, female bodies are almost never allowed to be both the sympathetic "lamenting mother and figure of pathos" and the "revenger armed with ferocious energy" (224). But *Hoffman*'s final scene sees Martha occupy both positions, albeit it with a slight concession or moderation of each. This combination demonstrates a fundamental complexity about female revenge, which is differentiated from male revenge because the "gender ideology inherent in . . . proper female conduct precludes any recognition of what we might view as heroic female action" (Clare 227). Thanks to the difficulty of reconciling patriarchy's limiting behavioral prescriptions with revenge's violent expectations, successful, sympathetic female revengers who survive beyond the play's final act are a rarity on the early modern stage. The tension between revenge and idealized femininity has profound implications on affective politics, as it forces women who seek revenge to practice affective governance at its most rarefied and challenging level. They must resist anger to the point that they reject the example of a Medea or of Juno, while still retaining enough anger to use as

propulsion toward vengeance. Martha completes this balancing act gracefully, and in the process rejects humoral conceits that negatively circumscribed female physiology and affect.

Like *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Hoffman* ends by giving its principal male character the final word at the drama's conclusion. But in a contrast to *The Spanish Tragedy*, Hoffman's last speech destabilize rather than reinforce the humoral theories thought to significantly determine male and female affective conditions and capabilities. Hoffman dies cursing his enemies, as might be expected given his intense hostility, but he directs the more significant portion of his vitriolic energy onto himself. While the crown sears his forehead, Hoffman chastises himself for the affective inconstancy that led to him being "fallen by a woman's hand" (5.3.125). In a perverse blazon, Hoffman fulminates against individual body parts which he sees as having rebelled against his intent to "be revenged on Austria, Saxony, / Prussia, Luningberg, and all their heirs" (5.3.149). He first rails against his "wretched" eyes that have "betrayed my heart: be you accursed, / And as the melting drops run from my brows, / So fall they on the strings that guide your heart, / Whereby their oily heat may crack them first" (5.3.151-55). Hoffman curses his eyes first because they were assumed to be one of the porous humoral body's most vulnerable points of entry; the eyes were understood as transmitting arresting images and impulses to the brain, which could produce corresponding humor, and subsequently thwart reason or intent. Because he was first infected and then bewildered by the image of Martha's beauty, Hoffman declares that his eyes have "betrayed" his heart. By referring to the eyes as "strings that guide" the heart, Hoffman degrades himself for allowing illogical affective impulses to alter his intent. In the next part of the blazon, he further bemoans his failure to govern affect with the discipline and restraint expected of a man:

> Boil on, thou foolish idle brain,

For giving entertainment to love's thoughts
A man resolved in blood, bound by a vow
For no less vengeance than his father's death
Yet become amorous of his foe's wife!
Oh sin against all conceit! Worthy this shame
And all the tortures this world can name (5.3.156-62).

When Hoffman names the "sin against all conceit" that justifies his torturous execution, he refers to his own inability to behave in a way befitting "a man resolved in blood, bound by a vow." In a direct contrast of humoral conceits which assumed that men could effectively govern affect, Hoffman fails to restrain his libidinous impulses, gives "entertainment to love's thoughts," becomes "amorous of his foe's wife," and subsequently fails in his revenge quest and pays the ultimate price. The play gives Hoffman extra emphasis because he delivers its final lines, but his failures position Martha as the play's preeminent governor of affect.

In significant part due to humoral theories, the early modern period entertained harshly unflattering notions of feminine physiology and affect. Tamora encapsulates many of these negative attributes in one female figure, as she reflects literary traditions and cultural conceptions which seemed to reflect and reinforce a humoral ontology. Humoral theories even work to negatively skew the perception of early modern characters who exude more charisma, intelligence, and agency than the grotesque Tamora. Though Bel-Imperia exhibits these sterling attributes, her death's ambiguity may be read to confirm humoral prejudices against women. Martha offers an important contrast to these more common conceptions of women illustrated by Tamora and Bel-Imperia. Her example suggests that even despite the early modern period's

misogynist physiological conceits, a powerful enough mind could discipline any body and allow a human subject – regardless of gender – to maintain mastery over their affective condition.

Conclusion: Martha and a Regiment of Not so Monstrous Women

Why does Martha deviate from the unflattering depiction of other female figures in revenge plays? *Hoffman*'s date of composition may help explain why Martha appears as a more competent affective governor than her female revenge predecessors. During and after the first decade of the seventeenth century, many plays including *Hoffman* began to include strong, graceful, admirable female characters in homage to Queen Elizabeth I. These characters signified a national appreciation of and nostalgia for Elizabeth, who died in 1603 but had become a symbol of sexual and moral purity during her reign. Shakespeare and his successor John Fletcher participate in this eulogizing trend in their co-written history play *Henry VIII*, which appeared in approximately 1612 and depicts the baby Elizabeth being blessed by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer. Cranmer predicts that "the royal infant" (5.4.17) will be an inspiration to rulers everywhere through the "princely graces / That mould up such a mighty piece as this is . . . all the virtues that attend the good, / Shall be doubled on her" (5.4.25-28). Yet Cranmer also betrays the national obsession with Elizabeth as a symbol of pure conduct when he foretells her death:

> She shall be, to the happiness of England,
>
> An aged princess; many days shall see her,

> And yet no day a deed to crown it.
>
> Would I had known no more! But she must die,
>
> She must, the saints must have her; yet a virgin,
>
> A most unspotted lily shall she pass
>
> To th' ground, and all the world shall mourn her (5.4.56-62).

Cranmer's augury that Elizabeth will pass "a most unspotted lily" literally refers to the legends of the Queen's virginity, but it also captures public admiration for her image as a sanctified figure of personal governance and a stabilizer of the nation. Not only is Elizabeth unspotted in her sexuality, but she refutes the weakness and inconsistency that, according to humoral theory, afflicted women by default. Her royal performance complicates the Galenic view of women's bodies and constitution as mainly fit for maternal purposes. Scott Newstok presents an example of this type of Galenic theory in his reading of John Knox's *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*. This text maintains that "women were constitutionally unfit to rule, for Kings 'ought to be constant [and] stable. Women . . . 'had vertues . . . not common with men . . . [woman is] a tendre creature, flexible, soft, and pitifull; whiche nature, God hath geuen unto her, that she may be apt to nourishe children'" (180). But Elizabeth's political prowess and personal reputation "echoes this masculine constancy and stability, and rejects flexibility, softness, and the nourishment of children" (180). Elizabeth's life, then, likely worked to counteract humoral discourses that depicted women as exclusively inconstant, maternal bodies.

Because of its 1602 composition date, *Hoffman* appears at the vanguard of a group of texts that feature strong, agentic females who admirably govern their feelings. In addition to Chettle's Martha, Webster's titular Duchess from *The Duchess of Malfi*, which is dated between 1612 and 1614, exhibits affective constancy, upstanding morality, and a level of courage typically expected of men. Strong women even appeared in comedy, particularly in Middleton and Dekker's 1611 city comedy *The Roaring Girl*. The titular female character of this play, the audacious Moll Cutpurse, rebuffs males who catcall her based on appearance and then disabuses other men of their understanding that women were mainly objects of beauty and sex. These new representations of women, made possible in part by Elizabeth's royal performance, counterbalance humoral discourse's negative view of female physiology and emotion. Such examples coincided with other emergent scientific discourses that would eventually shift medical knowledge away from the Galenic views consolidated in a text like *Mikrokosmographia*, including Paracelsus's early contributions to germ theory and William Harvey's research on blood flow. Combined with such advancements in medical science, the female characters mentioned here mark the beginning of a change in the understanding of and representation of female physiology and behavior. This shift acknowledges that women's bodies and behaviors are not determined by the limitations ascribed by humoral theory. Instead of being a Fury, women in drama could be a Martha, a Duchess, a Roaring Girl, or even an Elizabeth. These emergent modes of representation for women worked to point out the falsity of humoral determinism. Additionally, because they control their emotions through Senecan-inspired principles, these female figures indicate the ambivalent effects that Senecan affective philosophy exerted on humoral theory. While they contributed to humoral theory's vogue, Senecan philosophies also

undermined humoral theory's core deterministic tenets and thus enabled an epistemic shift towards biological knowledge later corroborated by advancements in the medical profession.

Works Cited

Antonucci, Barbara. "Blood in Language: The Galenic Paradigm of Humors in *The Rape of Lucrece* and *Titus Andronicus*." *Questioning Bodies in Shakespeare's Rome*. Edited by Maria Del Sapo Garbero et al. V&R Unipress, 2010, pp. 149-160.

Baraz, Daniel. "Seneca, Ethics, and the Body: The Treatment of Cruelty in Medieval Thought." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 195-215.

Belling, Catherine. "Infectious Rape, Therapeutic Revenge: Bloodletting and the Health of Rome's Body." *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage*, edited by Stephanie Moss and Kaara Peterson, Routledge, 2004, pp. 113-132.

Belsey, Catherine. "Tarquin Dispossessed: Expropriation and Consent in *The Rape of Lucrece*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*. vol. 52, no. 3, 2001, pp. 315-335.

Brown, Pamela. "Anatomy of an Actress: Bel-Imperia as Tragic Diva." *Shakespeare Bulletin*, vol. 33, no. 1, 2015, pp. 49-65.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, edited by Holbrook Jackson, New York Review of Books, 2001.

Burrow, Colin. *Shakespeare and Classical Antiquity*. Oxford University Press, 2013.

Chettle, Henry. *The Tragedy of Hoffman or a Revenge for a Father*. *Five Revenge Tragedies: Kyd, Shakespeare, Marston, Chettle, Middleton*. Edited by Emma Smith, Penguin, 2012, pp. 242-324.

Clare, Janet. *Revenge Tragedies of the Renaissance*. Northcote, 2003.

-------. "'She's Turned Fury': Women Transmogrified in Revenge Plays." *Revenge and Gender in Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance Literature*. Edited by Lesel Dawson and Fiona McCarthy, Edinburgh University Press, 2018, pp. 221-38.

Constantinidou, Natasha. "On Patronage, Fama and Court: Early Modern Political Culture." *Renaissance Studies*, vol. 24, no.4, 2010, pp. 597-610.

Craik, Katherine and Tanya Pollard. "Imagining Audiences." *Shakespearean Sensations: Experiencing Literature in Early Modern England*. Edited by Katherine Craik and Tanya Pollard. Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 1-25.

Crooke, Helkiah. *Mikrokosmographia a description of the body of man*. London: William Jaggard, 1615. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A19628.0001.001/1:7.14.2?rgn=div3;view=toc

Crosbie, Christopher. "'Oeconomia' and the Vegetative Soul: Rethinking Revenge in *The Spanish Tragedy*." *English Literary Renaissance*, vol. 38, No. 1, 2008, pp. 3-33.

Dawson, Lesel. "Introduction: Feminine Fury and the Masculine Spirit of Revenge." *Revenge and Gender in Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance Literature.* Edited by. Lesel Dawson and Fiona McHardy, Edinburgh University Press, 2018, 1-29.

Dubrow, Heather. *Captive Victors: Shakespeare's Narrative Poems and Sonnets*. Cornell University Press, 1987.

Evenepoel, Willy. "The Philosopher Seneca on Suicide." *Ancient Society,* vol. 34, 2004, pp 217-43.

Findlay, Allison. “Re-marking Revenge in Early Modern Drama.” *Revenge and Gender in Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance Literature*. Edited by Lesel Dawson and Fiona McCarthy, Edinburgh University Press, 2018, pp. 58-84.

Friedman, JB. “Another Look at Chaucer and the Physiognomists.” *Studies in Philology*, vol. 78, no. 2, 1981, pp. 138-52.

Galen. “The Art of Medicine.” *Galen: Selected Works*. Translated by P.N. Singer, Oxford World’s Classics, 1997, pp. 345-396.

-----. “Best Constitution of Our Bodies.” *Galen: Selected Works*. Translated by P.N. Singer, Oxford World’s Classics, 1997, pp. 292-298.

Garber, Marjorie. *Shakespeare and Modern Culture.* Anchor Books, 2008.

Graver, Margaret. “Philo of Alexandria and the Origin of the Stoic Προπάθειαι.” *Phronesis*. vol. 44, no. 4, 1999, pp. 300-325.

Greenwood, Davyyd. “Humoral/Environmental Theories and the Chain of Being.” *The Taming of Evolution*: *The Persistence of Non-Evolutionary Views in the Study of Humans*. Cornell University Press, 1984, pp. 27-43.

Hall, Edith. “Why are the Erinyes Female? or, What is so Feminine about Revenge?” *Revenge and Gender in Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance Literature*. Edited by Lesel Dawson and Fiona McCarthy, Edinburgh University Press, 2018, pp. 33-57.

Johnson, Bonnie. “Blood, Milk, Poison: Romeo and Juliet’s Tragedy of ‘Green’ Desire Corrupted Blood.” *Blood Matters: Studies in European Literature and Thought, 1400-*

1700. Edited by Bonnie Johnson and Eleanor Decamp, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018, pp. 134-148.

Kastan, David Scott. *Shakespeare and the Book.* Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Kerrigan, John. *Revenge Tragedy: Aeschylus to Armageddon*. Oxford University Press, 1996.

Kyd, Thomas. *The Spanish Tragedy*. Edited by J.R. Mulryne, Meuthen Drama, 2009.

Lange, Marjory. *Telling Tears in the English Renaissance*. EJ Brill, 1996.

Meek, Richard and Erin Sullivan Introduction. *The Renaissance of Emotion: Understanding Affect in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. Edited by Meek and Sullivan, Manchester University Press, 2015.

Mercer, Christina. "The Philosophical Roots of Western Misogyny." *Philosophical Topics*, vol. 46, no. 2, 2018, pp. 183-208.

Muir, Edward. *Mad Blood Stirring: Vendetta in Renaissance Italy*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Newstok, Scott. "'Turn Thy Throne Into a Tomb': Elizabeth I's Death Rehearsal." *Goddesses and Queens: The Iconography of Elizabeth I*. Edited by Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins, Manchester University Press, 2007, pp. 169-90.

Paster, Gail. *Humoring the Body: Emotions on the Shakespearian Stage.* University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Paster, Gail, et al. Introduction. *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the*

Cultural History of Emotion, Edited by Paster, Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004, 1-20.

Parvini, Neema. *Shakespeare's Moral Compass*. University of Edinburgh Press, 2018.

Perry, Curtis. "Seneca and the Modernity of *Hamlet*." *Illinois Classical Studie*s. vol. 40, no. 2, 2015, pp. 407-429.

Preedy, Chloe Kathleen. "'Women's Weapons': Education and Revenge on the Early Modern Stage." *Revenge and Gender in Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance Literature*. Edited by Lesel Dawson and Fiona McCarthy, Edinburgh University Press, 2018, pp. 181-202.

Rosenmeyer, Thomas. *Senecan Drama and Stoic Cosmology*. University of California Press, 1989.

Schoenfeldt, Michael. *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England: Physiology and Inwardness in Spencer, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Seneca. *De Ira*, translated by Aubrey Stewert, Coppell, Texas: Independent Publisher, 2020.

--. *Thyestes. Seneca: Phaedra and other Plays*. Translated by Scott Smith, Penguin, 2011, pp. 197-238.

--. *Hercules Furens. Seneca: Phaedra and other Plays*. Translated by Scott Smith, Penguin, 2011, pp. 3-51.

--. *Medea. Seneca: Six Tragedies*. Translated by Emily Wilson, Oxford World's Classics, 2010, pp. 71-101

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Edited by G.B. Evans, Houghton,

1997, pp. 1183-245.

--. *The Famous History of the Life of King Henry VIII. The Riverside Shakespeare*. Edited by G. Blakemore Evans et al., 2nd ed, Houghton, 1997, pp. 1026- 1063.

--. *The Rape of Lucrece. The Riverside Shakespeare*. Edited by G. Blakemore Evans et al., 2nd ed, Houghton, 1997, pp. 1814-38.

--. *Titus Andronicus*. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Edited by G. Blakemore Evans et al., 2nd ed, Houghton, 1997, pp. 1069-1100.

Shephard, Robert. "Court Factions in Early Modern England." *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 64, no. 4, 1992, pp. 721-745.

Spinrad, Phoebe. "The Fall of the Sparrow and the Map of Hamlet's Mind." *Modern Philology.* vol. 102, no. 4, 2005, pp. 453-77.

Strier, Richard. "Happy Hamlet." *Positive Emotions in Early Modern Literature and Culture*. Edited by Cora Fox, Bradley J. Irish, and Cassie M. Mlura. Manchester University Press, 2021, pp. 21-43.

Tarrant, R.J. "Greek and Roman in Seneca's Tragedies." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* vol. 97, 1995, pp. 215-230.

Tourner, Cyril. *The Atheist's Tragedy*. *Oxford World's Classics: Four Revenge Tragedies*. Edited by Katherine Maus, Oxford Classics, pp. 249-330.

Tribble, Evelyn. "Affective Contagion on the Early Modern Stage." *Affect Theory and Early Modern Texts: Poltics, Ecologies, and Form*. Edited by Amanda Bailey and Mario

DiGangi, Palgrave MacMillian, 2017, pp. 195-212.

Wells, Susan. *Robert Burton's Rhetoric: An Anatomy of Early Modern Knowledge.* Pennsylvania State University Press, 2019.

Winston, Jessica. "Senecan Tragedy in Early Elizabethan England." *Lawyers at Play: Literature, Law, and Politics at the Early Modern Inns of Court*. Oxford University Press, 2016.

Winter, Karin. "'Now I am Medea': Gender, Identity, and the Birth of Revenge in Seneca's *Medea*." *Revenge and Gender in Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance Literature*. Edited by Lesel Dawson and Fiona McCarthy, Edinburgh University Press, 2018, pp. 97-110.

Wright, Thomas. *The Passions of the Mind in General*, Edited by William Webster Newbold. Garland, 1986.

Wu, Tianyue. "Are First Movements Venial Sins? Augustinian Doctrine and Aquinas's Reinterpretation." *Fate, Providence, and Moral Responsibility in Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Thought: Studies in Honor of Carlos Steel.* Edited by Pieter d'Hoine and Gerd Van Riel, Leuven University Press, 2014, 475-494.

[1]This dissertation uses the terms "affect," "feeling," and "emotion" according to the nuanced definitions preferred by affect theorists. "Affect" refers to an unconscious and prepersonal inclination toward particular feelings. "Feelings" are the internal and authentic sensations that arise from one's affective state. "Emotions" are external displays of feelings, which can be either authentic or misleading.

[2] Schoenfeldt acknowledges that although humoral theory "appears at once deeply materialist and incorrigibly determinist, in actual practice it was possible to manipulate the humoral fluids and their concomitant behaviors through diet and evacuation" (2).

[3] In *Shakespeare and Modern Culture*, Marjorie Garber lists notable analyses of Hamlet by historical figures to argue that the play "holds up the mirror to nature and finds the critic reflected there. Readers, scholars, and actors have over the years consistently identified with the character of Hamlet, finding in his gifts and foibles an image of themselves" (201). Many of the observations she presents emphasize Hamlet's brooding: "Goethe's Hamlet lacks 'the strength of nerve which forms a hero,' while Coleridge's Hamlet 'procrastinates from thought, and loses the power of action in the energy of resolve'" (202). These types of historical judgments have contributed to a casual understanding of Hamlet as sad, melancholy, or indecisive.

[4] In "Seneca, Ethics, and the Body: The Treatment of Cruelty in Medieval Thought," Daniel Baraz draws direct connections between Senecan moral treatises and Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*. He states that *Summa Theologiae*'s "section on temperance" is based "almost exclusively on classical sources, primarily on Seneca's *De Clementia*" (196). Baraz highlights the consistency between Seneca's philosophy of cruelty in the moral treatises, explaining that *De Ira* contains a "view of cruelty . . . similar to that expressed in the first book of *De Clementia*" (199). Aquinas also read and quoted Seneca's *De Beneficiis*, as Mary Keys notes in *Aquinas and Aristotelian Magnanimity*.

[5] Tianyue Wu elaborates on Aquinas's opinion of the prepassions in "Are First Movements Venial Sins?: Augustinian Doctrine and Aquinas's Reintrepretation." She contends that Aquinas believed that the individual was morally culpable for "the first movement [toward passion] in terms of preventative control" (494). In his view, "we are held responsible for the first movements of sensuality because the will still reserves the power to do otherwise than passively waiting for the attack of a dangerous thought . . . It follows that the occurrence of such thought is an indirect result of the will" (490).

[6] Seneca describes his own pre-emptive meditation in Book 3 of *De Ira*. He argues that "it is best to prepare obstacles beforehand for vices which are known, and above all things tranquilize our mind that it may bear the most sudden and violent shocks either without feeling anger, or, if anger be provoked by the extent of some unexpected wrong, that it may bury it deep, and not betray its wound" (3.13). Seneca then offers readers some anti-anger arguments, so that they may be more inclined to withstand certain anger in certain situations. For example, he reminds readers no sane individual "returns kicks to a mule or bites to a dog" because these creatures lack the capacity to know they do wrong. He maintains that one should behave in the same manner to unintelligent humans: "If animals are protected from your anger by their want of

reason, you ought to treat all foolish men in the like manner: for if a man has that mental darkness which excuses all the wrongdoings of dumb animals, what difference does it make if in other respects he be unlike a dumb animal?" (3.27). Seneca also hopes to steel his readers against anger by explaining how it becomes habit and degrades spirit: "If you are angry, you will quarrel first with this man, and then with that: first with slaves, then with freedmen . . . your frenzy will drag you from one place to another . . . your madness will constantly meet with newly occurring irritants, and will never depart from you. Tell me, miserable man, what time you will have for loving? O, what good time you are wasting on an evil thing!" (3.28). By presenting his reader with these importations against anger before an incitement to anger arises, Seneca hopes to condition his reader against negative affects. Robert Burton utilizes the same tactic against anger in *The Anatomy of Melancholy.* He also preemptively equips readers with arguments against anger because he similarly believes that the best way ward off negative "passions and affections" is to "furnish ourselves with philosophical and divine precepts, other men's examples . . . to balance our hearts with love" (2.3.186).

[7] *The Passions of the Mind* immediately reveals debts to Seneca and Aquinas's investment in self-shaping, as it explicitly lays out the individual Christian's high level of moral responsibility for their feelings and behaviors. The book's introduction pits the Christian subject's active moral conscience against voluntary and involuntary influences on affect, describing the Christian life as a "a "warfare on Earth," a battlefield where one must continually be "rooting out vice and planting . . . virtue" so one be "ruled by reason and not tyrannized by preposterous affection" (91). The introduction makes clear that involuntary movements of the body may potentially thwart the Christian's moral mission, since "an operation that lodgeth in the soul can alter the body and move the humors from one place to another" (91). However, once successful in subduing unruly passions, the "mortified" Christian gains "great quietness of mind, and enableth himself better to the service of God (92).

[8] In *Robert Burton's Rhetoric: An Anatomy of Early Modern Knowledge*, Susan Wells explains that Seneca's influence in Burton's reflects a cross-section of the "sixteenth century arts tradition, with its prescribed lectures and readings in grammar, rhetoric, and logic, and with the orientation of Oxford to producing civil servants as well as well-trained divines. The books that Burton owned and cited in the *Anatomy* are deeply rooted in this tradition. . . Burton quoted extensively from Seneca, Virgil, Horace, Juvenal, Pliny, and Cicero, as we might expect from a university scholar with humanistic training" (15).

[9] Winston explains that the Inns of Court, where Seneca was translated, 'primarily provided legal training for the sons of the aristocracy and gentry" (32), ultimately serving as a finishing school "where ambitious men came to gain useful legal training while acquiring a cosmopolitan sophistication that would allow them to function at court and in other exclusive social circles" (33). The trainees at the Inns would move on to "positions in the Elizabethan court and government as secretaries, ambassadors, members of Parliament, and sometimes as counselors to the monarch herself" (34). The most successful of these men carried Seneca with them all the way to Queen Elizabeth's ear. Jasper Heywood, who translated the Senecan plays *Troas*, *Thyestes,* and *Hercules Furens* at the Inns in the late 1550s and early 60s, made contact with Elizabeth by offering her a personalized translation of *Troas* in 1559 as a "New Year's gift" (45).

[10] Burton had read or at least knew of Wright's work, as he namedrops him in *The Anatomy of Melancholy.* In Part 1, Section 2, Burton surveys previous literature on passions in order to review how passions "'produce a habit of melancholy . . . which, having gotten the mastery of our souls, may well be called diseases'" (1.2.252). His review acknowledges two Elizabethan sources alongside a litany of classical ones. These are Timothy Bright's 1586 treatise on melancholy and "Wright the Jesuit, in his book the *Passions of the Mind*" (1.2.252).

[11] Paster finds an example of this type of trauma in *Othello,* when she closely reads Othello's cistern speech in Act 4. She argues that, in this speech, Othello articulates terror and despair after realizing how "physical changes within himself" have caused alterations in his character and temperament (69). Poisoned and degraded by "the death of his passion" (71), Othello experiences "the great uncertainty" of a physiological process that wreaks its effects on the physical and psychological self (74). In her words, "it is Othello's tragedy to experience and describe this awful, life-destroying darkness directly, within himself. He imagines . . . inner bodily decay and death as . . . toads multiplying the dark and fetid fluids of his own damaged viscera" (76).

[12] Close intertextualities between *Antonio's Revenge* and *Hamlet* further support the assertion that Shakespeare would have known Senecan moral treatises. Perry notes that *Antonio's Revenge* and *Hamlet* "are roughly contemporaneous" and "share the same basic plot" because the two plays are participants in a "complex intertextual conversation" (416). He acknowledges other scholarship on theatrical competition and collaboration to remind readers that "Shakespeare and Marston were friendly rivals at this time . . . 'the plays were written . . . with each man regularly looking over the other's shoulder'" (416). Given the close connection between Shakespeare, Marston, and their works, it is likely that the two playwrights shared the same body of knowledge.

[13] Heather Dubrow identifies close links between *The Rape of Lucrece* and Senecan tragedy in her book *Captive Victors: Shakespeare's Narrative Poems and Sonnets*. She argues that like a Senecan tragedy, *The Rape of Lucrece* conveys extremity of emotion through monologue or soliloquy infused with bombastic or hyperbolic exclamations, longwinded allusions or metaphors, and appeals to the supernatural. She notes that some readers may find that this style makes the poem's depiction of rape seem estranged from "psychological reality or even common sense." But Dubrow reminds readers that in composing the poem, Shakespeare was "adhering to elaborate literary conventions . . . By the time he wrote *The Rape of Lucrece*, the lineaments of a certain type of set speech were well established . . . these speeches typically included such rhetorical devices as the apostrophe and the rhetorical question and such formulas as the appeal to the destines and the curse . . . Seneca is often credited – and even more often blamed – for shaping this literary type" (102-03).

[14] There has been much attention paid to Lucrece's gendered and moral quandary since the 1980s. Margaret Rice Vasileiou explains that during this period, critics including "Nancy J. Vickers, Heather Dubrow, Katharine Eisaman Maus, and Joel Fineman" refuted a longstanding "critical consensus that trivialized Shakespeare's *Lucrece* as a precious exercise in rhetorical excess" (47). Thanks significantly in part to their efforts, we now understand the poem's rhetoric

and metaphor as reflecting the "sexual violence and verbal self-dispossessions suffered by a woman living in the midst of patriarchy" (48).

[15] Tarquin makes an attempt at ethical affective management by telling his "unhallowed thoughts" to "die . . . before you blot / With your uncleanness that which is divine" (192-93). He lists several reasons to reject rape, including: its abhorrence to human virtue (195-96); that it will bring shameful dishonor to his royal name and progeny (197-210); the temporary pleasure of sex with Lucrece is too fleeting to be worthwhile (211-17); and that he violates Collatine's camaraderie by abusing Lucrece (232-38).

[16] In early modern amatory verses, love-stricken male speakers often depict themselves as passive objects unable to resist the force of depersonalized feminine attributes. Tarquin's lines reflect this pattern because they give grammatical agency to Lucrece's "beauty," which "pleadeth" and render him "dumb." The lines seem to suggest that Tarquin has decreased autonomy. However, they should be balanced with awareness of Tarquin's agency in deliberately constructing an image of himself; he is a male orator who chooses to recite poetic love conceits to control his humor and induce himself to an even more desirous state.

[17] Paster's research explains how early modern notions of humoral physiology led to the assumption that women, because of their cold bodies, held "limited capacity for productive agency, individuality, and higher reasoning" (79). The humoral understanding of women's bodies will be fully explored in the next chapter.

[18] *In English Revenge Drama,* Linda Woodbridge notes that "after 1530, Luther and Melanchthon suddenly held that 'any ruler who becomes a tyrant may be lawfully and forcefully opposed' (Skinner II: 74). The twenty-ninth homily of Calvin's Homilies on the First Book of Samuel . . . conclude[s] that magistrates ordained by God may 'constrain the prince' (Skinner II:214)" (141).

[19] Wright notes that logic indeed possesses the capacity to "stir up or suppress the affectations of man" (219). Although "not every kind of reason hath force to stir up a passion" (219), an urgent reason with "great perspicuity and apertness in delivery" can make an effect on the humors (225).